FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-068
Monday
9 April 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-068 CONTENTS *9 April 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- Gremitskikh 6 Apr Briefing on World Issues ... 1
  - Jaruzelski Visit *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Gorbachev Visit to U.S. *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Situation in Afghanistan *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Lithuania, Latvian Party Congress *[TASS]* ... 1
  - Lithuania Events on Summit *[Moscow International]* ... 2
  - Japan's 'Cold War Stereotypes' *[TASS]* ... 2
  - TASS Summary ... 2
- Hurd Discusses European Security Prospects *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* ... 3
- Sofia Conference Discusses Black Sea Environment *[TASS]* ... 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Shevardnadze Concludes Talks in Washington ... 5
  - 'Vast' Agenda of Talks Detailed *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* ... 5
  - Baker-Shevardnadze Talks 'Tense' *[Moscow Radio]* ... 5
  - 'Substantive Talk' Held With Bush *[TASS]* ... 6
  - Moscow TV Reports Progress of Talks ... 6
  - Shevardnadze Holds News Conference *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* ... 7
  - Shevardnadze Fields Questions *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* ... 9
  - Baker Comments at News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* ... 12
  - Shevardnadze Assesses Talks *[Moscow TV]* ... 12
  - Shevardnadze Departs for Moscow *[TASS]* ... 13
- Bush, Baker Cited on Talks With Shevardnadze *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 8 Apr]* ... 13
- IZVESTIYA on Shevardnadze U.S. Talks *[8 Apr]* ... 14
- TASS Notes U.S. Views on Shevardnadze Visit ... 15
- Moscow TV Views Shevardnadze's U.S. Visit ... 15
- IZVESTIYA Notes Summit Date Announced *[7 Apr]* ... 16
- Text of Gorbachev Interview on Summit Published *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* ... 16
- 'Top Priority' on Upcoming Summit With U.S. *[Moscow Radio]* ... 17
- D'Amato Not Allowed Entrance Into Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* ... 20
- Lithuanian Officials Invited to U.S. Consulate *[Vilnius International]* ... 20

West Europe

- Agenda, Preparations for Visit by UK's Hurd *[TASS]* ... 20
- Ryzhkov Receives Swiss Government Official *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* ... 21
- Biryukova, Delegation Depart for Drug Conference *[TASS]* ... 21
  - Arrives in London *[TASS]* ... 21
- Mogilev Hosts Netherlands-Soviet Joint Venture *[IZVESTIYA 30 Mar]* ... 21

Latin America & Caribbean

- Foreign Ministry Statement in Nicaragua Published *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* ... 22
- Burlyay Expresses Concern Over Contra 'Threat' *[TASS]* ... 23
- Sidorov Views Prospects in Nicaragua *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Apr]* ... 23
- TV Marti Broadcasts to Cuba Condemned *[TASS]* ... 24

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Secession Law To Be Enacted When Published *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 25
Supreme Soviet Agenda for 9 April *[Moscow Radio]* 25
  Both Chambers To Meet *[TASS]* 25
Supreme Soviet Debates General Youth Policy *[Moscow Radio]* 25
U.S. Resolution on Lithuania Termed 'Interference' *[TASS]* 26
Supreme Soviet Defense Committee Meets *[Moscow Radio]* 26
  Military Reform Examined *[Moscow Radio]* 27
Committee Rejects Socialist Enterprise Bill *[TASS]* 28
New Subcommission on Northern Peoples Formed *[Moscow Radio]* 28
Supreme Soviet Committee Work Reported *[Moscow TV]* 28

Political & Social

Text of Law on Republic Secession *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 29
Ligachev Calls for 'Cleansing' of CPSU Ranks *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 8 Apr]* 32
Shevardnadze Interviewed on 'View' Program *[Moscow TV]* 33
Shevardnadze Returns From U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 34
Procuracy Seeks Gdlyan-Ivanov Indictment *[Moscow TV]* 34
  Medvedev Views Issue *[Moscow TV]* 34
CPSU Decision on Need To 'Restructure' PRAVDA *[Moscow Radio]* 36
  Text of Resolution *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 36
Draft Statute on Party Control, Auditing Body *[TASS]* 40
Social Democrats Urge Break With Party *[AFP]* 40
Military Parade To Mark Victory Over Fascism *[TASS]* 40
Militia Uncovers Bomb Factory, Illegal Weapons *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Yakovlev, Bakatin on Presidential Council *[TASS]* 41
Further on Maslennikov's 3 Apr Press Briefing *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Apr]* 42
Inter-Regional Group's Record Examined *[NEW TIMES No 14]* 42
Soviet Constitutional Democrats To Form Party *[Moscow International]* 43
Liberal Democratic Party Tasks, Aims Viewed *[TASS]* 44
Prospects of Springtime Strike 'Offensive' Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 44
Deputy Discusses Psychiatric 'Abuse' *[Moscow Radio]* 45
ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Editor Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 1 Apr]* 45

Economic

USSR Price Reform To Take Place in Jan 1991 *[AFP]* 46
Economic Reform Body Chairman on Market Economy *[TASS]* 46
Industrial Output Decline Continues in March *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 47

Scientific

'Cosmos' Satellites Launched 6 Apr *[TASS]* 48
Cosmonauts Study Space's Influence on Materials *[TASS]* 48

Military

General on Anti-Aircraft Defense Capability *[TASS]* 48
Air Defense Chief Tretyak Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 49
Army, Navy Report, Election Meetings Summarized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 50

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Batlic Republics

Reportage on Takeover of Vilnius Press Palace 51
  Staff To Defend Press Palace *[Vilnius Radio]* 51

  - Events Described *[Vilnius International]* 51
  - Union Chairman Interviewed *[Vilnius Radio]* 51
  - Lithuanian Minister Comments *[Vilnius Radio]* 52
  - More on Press Palace Incident *[Moscow Radio]* 53
  - Volunteer Guards Detained *[Vilnius Radio]* 54
- 'Thick Human Chain' Surrounds Press Building *[Warsaw Radio]* 54
- Pickets Urged To Remain Outside Press Building *[Vilnius Radio]* 54
- Program Warns of 'Provocators' Among Pickets *[Vilnius Radio]* 54
- Picketers at Procuracy Send Protest to Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 55
- Landsbergis Calls for Attendance at Vilnius Rally *[Vilnius Radio]* 55
- Vilnius Radio Carries 7 April Vilnius Rally 56
  - Landsbergis Speaks 56
  - Landsbergis Continues 56
  - Military Conscription Addressed 56
  - Gorbachev Appeal Read 57
  - Latvian Deputy Speaks 57
  - Appeal To Yazov Read 58
- Landsbergis Addresses 7 April Vilnius Rally *[Vilnius Radio]* 58
- Pro-Independence Vilnius Rally Described *[Vilnius International]* 58
  - Further on Vilnius Rally *[Moscow TV]* 59
  - Text of Message to Yazov *[Vilnius Radio]* 60
  - Resolution Approved *[Vilnius Radio]* 60
- Afanasyev Speaks at Vilnius Press Palace Rally *[Vilnius Radio]* 60
- TASS Reports on Vilnius Rally, Resolution 61
- Vilnius Correspondent on Response to Strike Call *[Moscow TV]* 61
- Lithuania Receives Ryzhkov Message *[Vilnius Radio]* 62
- Lithuanians Warned To Comply With Call-Up *[TASS]* 62
- Lithuania Halts Military Conscription Activities *[Vilnius Radio]* 62
- Defense Ministry Statement on 'Anti-Army Campaign' *[TASS]* 63
- General Condemns Landsbergis Anti-Draft Address *[TASS]* 63
- Airborne Troop Commander Interview in Baltics *[TASS]* 64
- Commander Describes Paratroop Role in Lithuania *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 64
- 'Soyuz' Members Warn of Escalating Tension *[TASS]* 65
- 'Soyuz' Deputies Call for Presidential Rule *[Moscow TV]* 65
- Minorities' Rights in Lithuania Said Violated *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Apr]* 66
- 'Unsteady Balance' Prevailing in Lithuania *[TASS]* 66
- Internal Troops Reinforced at Procuracy Building *[Vilnius Radio]* 67
- Lithuanian Deputy Describes Yakovlev Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 67
- TASS Views Importance of Lithuanian 'Problem' 67
- Brazauskas Interviewed in Hospital *[Vilnius Radio]* 68
- Brazauskas on Lithuanian Reply to Gorbachev *[Vilnius International]* 69
- Council Halts Supplies, Finances to Commissariats *[Moscow Radio]* 70
- Papers Appearing Regularly, Overflights Continue *[Vilnius Anniversary]* 70
- Lithuania Message to Georgia Marks Anniversary *[Vilnius Radio]* 70
- Klaipeda Rally Expresses Alarm Over Future *[Moscow International]* 70
- Russian Lithuanians Interviewed on Independence *[Moscow TV]* 70
- Correspondent Rounds Up Events in Lithuania *[Moscow Radio]* 71
- Commentator Views Situation in Lithuania *[Moscow TV]* 72
- Belorussian People's Front Chairman Interviewed *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
- Estonian Supreme Soviet Declaration on Congress *[RAHVA HAAL 31 Mar]* 73
- City Council Claims Estonian Resolution Invalid *[TASS]* 74
- Latvian Communist Party Splits; Leader Elected *[Riga Radio]* 74
- Riga Radio Carries 6 Apr Latvian CP Congress 74
  - Editorial Commission Established 74
  - Party Restructuring Viewed 75
  - Vagris Reports on Party Activities 76
  - Income Sources Discussed 76
  - Historical Mistakes Viewed 77
- Vagris Cited on 'Third Way' to Independence *[TASS]* 77
- Pugo Addresses 7 April Latvian CP Congress *[Riga Radio]* 78
- 'Stormy Debates' as Latvian Congress Adjourns *[Moscow Radio]* 80

Pugo Answers Questions at Latvian Congress *[Riga Radio]* 80
Vagris Addresses 6 Apr Party Congress *[Riga Radio]* 81
Independents Walk Out of Latvian Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 83
Riga Radio Carries 7 Apr Latvian CP Congress 83
    Party Renewal Stressed 83
    Delegates Debate Party Unity 83
    Ideology, Politics Debated 84
    Party Resolution Debated 84
    Walk-out by Delegates 85
    Delegates Continue Debate 86
    Party Independence Debated 86
Pugo Views New Voices at Latvian Party Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 87

Caucasus

Anniversary of Tbilisi Demonstration Commemorated 87
    Gorbachev Message *[Moscow International]* 87
    Leningrad Rally Held *[AFP]* 87
    Crowds Rally in Tbilisi *[AFP]* 88
    More on Tbilisi Rally *[AFP]* 88
Armenian Communist Party 1st Secretary Elected *[TASS]* 89
    Secretary Movsisyan Profiled *[TASS]* 89
    Movsisyan Addresses Plenum *[Yerevan Radio]* 90
Armenian, Azerbaijani Procurators Present Reports *[Moscow TV]* 90
    Prosecutors Criticized *[TASS]* 90

Gremitskikh 6 Apr Briefing on World Issues

Jaruzelski Visit

LD0604142390 Moscow TASS in English 1352 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—At a briefing here today, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh voiced confidence that Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski's official visit to the Soviet Union "will serve to deepen mutual understanding, trust and cooperation between the two countries and peoples."

The visit will be of special importance in the light of major changes in the two countries in the political and economic fields, Gremitskikh pointed out.

"The visit will enable the two presidents to exchange views on a wide range of matters concerning bilateral relations and, of course, to consider the most topical international problems, primarily the situation in Europe and the development of the all-European process," Gremitskikh said.

Gorbachev Visit to U.S.

LD0604142690 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The setting of the date for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States from May 30 to June 3 this year captured headlines throughout the world, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

The spokesman agreed with the opinion of many Western commentators who note that this accord and the announcement of the visit before the Soviet foreign minister's talks in Washington are completed "are an illustration of a serious and profound approach by the sides to the development of bilateral relations and to the discussion on topical world issues."

Situation in Afghanistan

LD0604164890 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The military situation in Afghanistan has not undergone any considerable changes, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today with reference to information from Kabul.

The progressive forces of Afghanistan, he said, continue the search for ways towards a peaceful settlement of the situation in the country and the formation of a coalition government.

The draft programme of a Front for a Peaceful Afghanistan (FPA) worked out by a special coordinating commission, is now under discussion in Afghanistan. Representatives of all the nine officially registered parties took part in the commission's work. The FPA will consist of independent parties and public organisations. The People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan will be part of the FPA on the same basis as other parties and organisations.

All this creates prerequisites for the FPA to become the basis for a future coalition government, Gremitskikh said.

Speaking of Afghanistan's joining the Interparliamentary Union, he said that "This decision is justly regarded as the recognition of the Afghan Parliament's big contribution to the implementation of the national reconciliation policy and a settlement of the Afghan problem by peaceful means."

In a broader context this event can be also viewed as the recognition of growing international prestige of Afghanistan which pursues a peaceful, well-considered course towards the establishment of lasting peace in the country and in the region, Gremitskikh said.

Lithuania, Latvian Party Congress

LD0604162290 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—At a briefing here, commenting on matters connected with the situation in Lithuania, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh pointed to the need to resolve arising problems "reasonably, on the basis of the Soviet Constitution and Soviet laws, without taking separatist, unilateral and extremist actions."

He voiced an opinion that the problem was brought into being by the "ill-considered actions of certain circles in Lithuania."

Speaking of the possible effect of the situation in Lithuania on the process of preparations for and on the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit itself, Gremitskikh expressed hope that the reasonable approach to the problem of relations between Lithuania and the Soviet federation will grow in Lithuania, just as "the level of understanding that, apart from these problems, there are also global ones concerning the entire Soviet Union, all Soviet people, the whole world."

He also expressed hope that the dialogue that has been started will lead to growing understanding of this entire package of issues and that "the American side will also approach questions of preparations for the summit in earnest, responsibly, as has been the case before."

In view of the beginning of a congress of the Latvian Communist Party (LCP), Gremitskikh recalled the CPSU-LCP leadership's meeting, at which Mikhail Gorbachev made a speech.

Gremitskikh voiced hope that people in Latvia "will not act under the pressure of nationalist emotions."

In answer to a question by a U.S. journalist about the intentions of U.S. Senator Alfonse d'Amato to cross the Polish-Lithuanian border without a Soviet visa, Gremitskikh said: "Just as you, I am also curious to know how this undertaking will end."

Lithuania Events on Summit

LD0604180590 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] A Soviet Foreign Ministry official, Yuriy Gremitskikh, appearing at a news conference in Moscow on Friday, was asked whether the events in Lithuania were likely to affect the process of preparations for the super power summit and the summit itself?

[Gremitskikh recording in Russian fading into English report] The Soviet official said he hoped that Lithuania would show greater wisdom in its approach to relations with the center because of the wider implications these are likely to have on global issues. He hoped that the emerging dialogue will widen, and called for the dispute to be resolved on the basis of the national constitution and laws rather then by unilateral extremist moves. The center would try to clarify its national policy to Lithuania's officials and its people.

On preparations for the summit, Gremitskikh said he hoped the Americans will act as responsibly as they had before.

Asked if the military's concern over the events in Lithuania was likely to create difficulties for President Gorbachev's effort to have conventional forces in Europe reduced, Gremitskikh made this point:

[Gremitskikh recording in Russian fading into English report] He said the dispute emerged following rash actions by certain groups in Lithuania and that the center had now taken measures to protect the interests of the Soviet Union and its citizens residing in Lithuania on the basis of the existing constitution and laws. He said the center reaffirmed that is was ready for dialogue with all groups in Lithuania in an effort to settle all issues legally.

On his country's disarmament policy, Gremitskikh said it remained unchanged. The Foreign Ministry official said the Soviet Union was opposed to delays in all areas of disarmament and called for all the objectives to be discussed at negotiations.

Japan's 'Cold War Stereotypes'

LD0604162890 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The Soviet Foreign Ministry has denied allegations about an increasing Soviet threat to Japan, recently made in the Japanese parliament by some government officials.

Commenting on the statements that the quantiative reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East is being accompanied by the modernisation of the remaining troops and growth of their military capability, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today that Japanese officials had made many such statements recently, which was evidence of the fact that some politicians had not yet abandoned "cold war" sterotypes.

At the same time, Gremitskikh went on to say, more and more Japanese are realising the need to search for ways of the gradual development of Soviet-Japanese relations. It is no longer easy for official Tokyo to pretend not to notice the changes taking place in the Asia-Pacific region and in the whole world and continue its own military buildup. The Soviet threat myth is again used by them as a pretext for justifying this policy, he said.

"The Soviet troops located in the Far East are carrying out exclusively defensive tasks. If the Japanese side has any worries on this matter, the Soviet Union is ready to discuss them as well as broader issue of detente in the Asia-Pacific region at any level and with any number of participants," Gremitskikh said.

TASS Summary

LD0604180690 Moscow TASS in English 1745 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The setting of the date for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States from May 30 to June 3 this year captured headlines throughout the world, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

The spokesman agreed with the opinion of many Western commentators who note that this accord and the announcement of the visit before the Soviet foreign minister's talks in Washington are completed "are an illustration of a serious and profound approach by the sides to the development of bilateral relations and to the discussion of topical world issues."

Speaking of the possible effect of the situation in Lithuania on the process of preparations for and on the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit itself, Gremitskikh expressed hope that the reasonable approach to the problem of relations between Lithuania and the Soviet federation will grow in Lithuania, just as "the level of understanding that, apart from these problems, there are also global ones concerning the entire Soviet Union, all Soviet people, and the whole world."

He also expressed hope that the dialogue that has been started will lead to growing understanding of this entire package of issues and that "the American side will also approach questions of preparations for the summit in earnest, responsibly, as has been the case before."

Touching upon a forthcoming official visit to the Soviet Union by Polish President Wojciech Jaruzelski, Yuriy Gremitskikh said the visit will be of special importance in the light of major changes in the two countries in the political and economic fields.

The forthcoming visit to the USSR of British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, scheduled for April 9-12, will be an important landmark in this year's Anglo-Soviet political contacts. The agenda will include a meeting with President Gorbachev and official talks with his Soviet counterpart.

The eleventh conference of the World Media Association, which is to be held here on April 9, will contribute to the spiritual rapprochement of people and to the expansion of international contacts and cooperation.

More than 500 representatives from 60 countries have applied to participate in the conference. Reports will be delivered by some 40 former heads of state and government, as well as other prominent political leaders. They will deal with such vital problems as the development of East-West cooperation and the influence exerted on the world situation by new thinking, perestroyka and glasnost. The Korean People's Democratic Republic has shown an understanding that the Soviet Union is interested and in need of developing contacts with South Korea along certain lines, the Soviet spokesman pointed out.

Responding to a question about Pyongyang's reaction to Soviet-South Korean contacts, the Soviet spokesman stressed that "the Soviet side is in good contact with the Korean People's Democratic Republic."

"We are bound together by the treaty of friendship and cooperation, we are holding intergovernmental and interparty dialogue, and we cooperate along all lines," he said.

As regards relations between the Soviet Union and South Korea, he added, "we keep North Korea informed and discuss our viewpoints."

Having noted the present potential for the development of practical relations with South Korea, such as issuing visas for mutual trips, trade and economic links and the air traffic, the Soviet spokesman noted at the same time that the question of diplomatic recognition of South Korea "is not topical for an entire range of reasons."

Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yan Burlyay spoke at the briefing here. He said that the Geneva talks between the San Salvador Government and the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMNLF) with the participation of the UN secretary-general were "an important positive step towards settling the protracted conflict in San Salvador by peaceful political means."

Burlyay called on the states which, due to their contacts in the region, exert particular influence on developments there and therefore contribute to the success of the talks. They must, more than ever before, take well considered and far-sighted steps to establish a genuine and just peace in San Salvador and carry out democratic reforms there.

The Soviet Union condemns the beginning of TV-Marti broadcasts to Cuba and regards them as a violation of international law and interference in internal affairs of a sovereign country, said Yan Burlyay. The beginning of live broadcasts to Cuba by TV-Marti cannot but negatively affect the situation in Latin America and in the whole world.

Hurd Discusses European Security Prospects

PM0604121390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Douglas Hurd: I Am Going to the USSR in Good Spirits"]

[Text] London, 5 Apr—British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd called his upcoming visit to the USSR a "logical link in the constantly expanding contacts between the two countries."

The head of the British Foreign Office, who goes to the Soviet Union on 9 April, stressed at a meeting with Soviet journalists that he had "always regarded talks with E.A. Shevardnadze as constructive and useful."

"Our bilateral relations are becoming significantly more active at the moment in many spheres," the foreign secretary went on. "One might point to academic exchanges. Incidentally, in Moscow I will be signing an agreement on cultural cooperation. And, of course, as you know, the biggest British event that has ever been held in your country. I am referring to the exhibition that opens in Kiev in June. So I will be going in good spirits." However, the head of the British Foreign Office pointed out that he was not satisfied with the current level of Soviet-British relations in the trade and economic sphere. "I believe we have a long way to go yet," the foreign secretary said. According to him, changes in the USSR should contribute to the activation of cooperation in this sphere.

The foreign secretary was asked what role he allocated to the "two-plus-four" mechanism in the German unification process. "Like the Soviet Union," D. Hurd replied, "we attach very great importance to this mechanism. I hope it will acquire even greater importance after the formation of the new GDR Government. I believe that special attention at the talks will be paid to discussions on European security. We have many attitudes in common in this sphere, I believe."

"I think the 'two-plus-four' mechanism is extremely important for the solution of the external aspects of German unification," the minister pointed out. "For 30 years we have been arguing that the Germans have the right to self-determination and unification. But in recent months we have been advocating consideration of the exernal aspects of unification, which have a direct bearing on other countries—yours and ours, the United States, France, and all members of the European community and NATO. All these countries have different, but legitimate interests which must be discussed. There are different frameworks for debate. The 'two-plus-four' mechanism is a very important part of them."

"But the Helsinki process is important too," the Foreign Office head stressed. "Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher recently made an important statement on this question in Cambridge. We are looking forward to the 'Helsinki-II' meeting, which, I believe, will not solve all the problems, but will give a fillip to the creation of a system that will significantly strengthen the Helsinki Final Act."

Answering a question about what areas of work within the CSCE process framework are the most important in his view, the foreign secretary said: "Some important foundations were laid in the Helsinki Final Act itself and they must be developed further. You have the question of human rights and of borders, pledges on which could be reaffirmed. Personally, I propose that a reconciliation system should be created, a peacemaking system, because I foresee, indeed I can see already, a large number of disputes on ethnic grounds in Central and Eastern Europe, where such a system could help." Talking about the North Atlantic alliance, D. Hurd stressed: "We believe that the preservation of NATO is an important part of European security and we want Germany to remain in NATO, but we should also develop the Helsinki process."

In view of the fact that the British Government continues to advocate keeping nuclear armaments on the continent, despite the significant changes in Europe, the minister was asked whether he considered that in years to come London would find it increasingly difficult to demonstrate the need for this. "I believe that it is impossible to completely separate conventional from nuclear armaments," D. Hurd said. "We will have to, as we do now, combine the two types of armaments. But it will be a different combination, at a much lower level. Nevertheless I do believe that the nuclear component will remain in the European defense system, whether one is talking about the West or the East. What we in the West have not worked out yet (hitherto there has been no need) is a position on the question what this component should actually be." "It is a question of numbers," the foreign secretary noted. "The principles are not in doubt. How do you protect conventional armaments? It is a debate which we are yet to have. The Vienna talks should end in the conclusion of an agreement, but that is not the end of the process, just an intermediate stage. We have 'grown' this agreement, now we will reap the harvest and put it in the granary. But then new shoots will appear, which we will have to consider in the future."

Against whom would tactical nuclear weapons stationed in FRG and incapable of reaching the USSR be directed? "Against any potential attack," the foreign secretary said. "The purpose of all armaments is deterrence. Life is full of the unexpected. It is our premise that the possibility of an attack has not been completely ruled out. Of course, the danger of such an attack has dwindled. I will not say now what the nuclear component of the Western defense system should be in the future. The question will have to be discussed, above all with our allies."

What kind of Europe does D. Hurd see in 2000? The foreign secretary laughed: "Now that really is a hypothetical question and it is not an easy one to answer. I think there will be a Western alliance and there will be an all-embracing security structure, based on the Helsinki process, which will by then have been significantly transformed, and there will also be a European community. I do not know how many members it will have then, but it will still be a community of sovereign states, cooperating with one another."

Sofia Conference Discusses Black Sea Environment

LD0604231590 Moscow TASS in English 1945 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Sofia April 6 TASS—Experts of the Foreign Ministries of the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Romania, and Turkey had a regular meeting in Sofia on April 3-6 to elaborate a convention on the protection and conservation of the Black Sea environment.

The experts coordinated a number of the main elements of the future convention conditions, and worked out, in the main, drafts of a convention and additional protocols to combat oil spills and discharges of other harmful substances and to prevent the pollution of other harmful substances and to prevent the pollution of the Black Sea from on-shore sources.

However, some aspects still remain uncoordinated. Not all participants agreed with the Soviet Union-suggested introduction of a general ban on the dumping of wastes and other materials in the Black Sea, including dangerous wastes, with the exception of excavated earth.

The sides agreed to continue their work on the text of the convention.

United States & Canada

Shevardnadze Concludes Talks in Washington

'Vast' Agenda of Talks Detailed

PM0704155190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talks in Washington"]

[Text] Washington, 6 Apr—The beginning of full-scale talks on Thursday between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker coincided with the announcement of an agreement as regards the date of the impending meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents.

"I am very glad that a date has been set" for the Soviet-U.S. summit, U.S. President G. Bush said during a brief meeting with reporters. "It is very important," he continued, "for us to have these conversations. Dialogue is very important and I will be glad to see Gorbachev here."

During their 15-hour day of negotiations E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Baker had three private conversations, but most of the time was devoted to a detailed examination of the vast agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations involving experts on disarmament problems, regional affairs, human rights, questions of bilateral, in particular, economic relations, and transnational subjects.

The discussion on various aspects of arms limitation was perhaps the most intensive. The state of affairs as regards the elaboration of an agreement on radical cuts in strategic offensive arms was analyzed and opinions were also exchanged on those talks which should follow the conclusion of this treaty and lead to the further strengthening of strategic stability. Solutions were sought to hitherto unresolved questions of conventional arms reductions in Europe, the banning and destruction of chemical weapons, and the elaboration of the "open skies" regime. They touched on problems of nuclear tests and the nonproliferation of missiles and missile technology.

There was a detailed and extensive discussion of regional subjects. The recent progress made in southern Africa and Central America with USSR and U.S. participation is reassuring. Some elements of this positive experience may also be used with reference to other regions. No conflict zone was ignored: The sides discussed the Near East, the Horn of Africa, Mozambique, the situation in the Republic of South Africa, Cambodia, and the Korean peninsula. In a number of cases new ideas designed to help relax tension and make progress toward a settlement were voiced. The ministers and experts comprehensively analyzed various external aspects of German unity and its correlation with the general European process. Although, as might have been expected, there were definite differences of approach toward individual questions such as, for instance, the military-political status of a united Germany and the advisability of elaborating a peace treaty, the discussion was undoubtedly useful as regards the preparations for the active operation of the "two plus four" mechanism. The discussion of humanitarian problems and human rights once again showed that the practice of mutual accusations and recriminations has become a thing of the past.

Proceeding on the premise that the summit meeting should herald significant progress in bilateral cooperation, including trade and economic cooperation, a rough estimate was made of specific agreements which could be prepared during the coming few weeks.

The transnational theme, which is relatively new to Soviet-U.S. dialogue, was full of weighty subject matter. There was a useful discussion of environmental problems and questions relating to the fight against terrorism under this rubric. The Soviet-U.S. talks will continue.

Baker-Shevardnadze Talks 'Tense'

LD0604191390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Report by station corespondent Vladimir Zvyagin from Washington]

[Excerpts] At the U.S. State Department this morning, Shevardnadze, USSR foreign affairs minister, who is staying on a working visit in Washington, and U.S. Secretary of State Baker began their second one-on-one meeting. Immediately after the meeting ends, Comrade Shevardnadze will visit the White House, where he is to hold a conversation with President Bush. The U.S. secretary of state will also take part in it. As expected, during the conversation they will discuss practical questions concerning preparations for the upcoming summit meeting between the Soviet and the U.S. leaders. Our correspondent Vladimir Zvyagin reports from Washington:

[Zvyagin] [passage omitted] The talks are tense. But at the same time they have revealed a number of complexities which Soviet and U.S. experts will come across in the seven weeks preceding the summit meeting. A high-ranking official of the U.S. Administration stated that the United States wishes to submit at the talks a major new proposal in the sphere of nuclear arms limitation concerning a ban on all land-based ballistic missiles with multiple warheads. As observers believe, that could noticeably complicate the prospect of signing an agreement, scheduled for this summit meeting, on a 50-percent reduction of strategic nuclear arms. This is only one problem which the participants of the talks have encountered. Yet the range of questions being discussed now in Washington is extremely broad.

Comrade Shevardnadze has brought a personal message to George Bush from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. This is a continuation, as they describe it here, of the personal diplomacy between the leaders of our countries. Both sides have already made it clearly understood that they wish this meeting to be a proper working and productive one, above all because serious results are expected from it by our peoples, and because there are enormous reserves for a considerable broadening of cooperation between our countries in all spheres.

'Substantive Talk' Held With Bush

LD0704081490 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 7 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, during his working visit to the United States, met President George Bush and had a substantive talk with him for about two hours and a half.

George Bush asked to convey his personal greetings to Mikhail Gorbachev. Soviet-American relations, he noted, are particularly important in our complex but very interesting times.

The best wishes from Gorbachev were conveyed to President Bush and a message from the Soviet president was handed over to him.

Shevardnadze and Bush considered fundamentally the state and dynamics of Soviet-American relations in which there were many changes over the past five years. The relations are no longer marked with suspicion and the "habit" to reject right away the other side's initiatives. The current state of dialogue enables a frank and open discussion of any, even the most difficult problems.

George Bush's statement, made on the eve of the Malta meeting, on a new closeness between the USSR and the USA and Gorbachev's statement at the meeting that the Soviet Union does not regard the United States as an adversary, the Soviet minister said, opened up new vistas for Soviet-American cooperation.

The U.S. President spoke in the same vein: It is not the other side, but instability and unpredictibility which are an adversary.

The discussion of specific aspects of Soviet-American relations revealed the parallel character of the sides' efforts to develop and perfect these relations. The two sides reaffirmed the mutual desire to successfully complete, on the basis of what has already been attained, the drafting of a treaty on radical cuts in strategic offensive armaments, by overcoming the still existing difficulties.

Substantive talks are also underway in other disarmament areas: cuts in conventional troops in Europe, "the open skies", prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons and nuclear tests. There are the outlines for a breakthrough in the main areas. Extra impulses are required for a number of problems.

It was noted with satisfaction that Soviet-American cooperation in settling regional conflicts had already produced tangible results in a number of cases. Both sides are willing to actively continue this cooperation, considering the fact that the favourable character of the Soviet-American cooperation in regional affairs won broad international recognition.

The two sides noted the importance of close consultations between the USSR and the USA on European problems, particularly in the light of the current advancement towards German unity.

George Bush said that the Soviet all-European home concept was in tune with the American united and free Europe concept.

Serious work to establish a reliable foundation for Soviet-American cooperation in the trade and economic area is going on, most intensively after the Malta meeting, it was noted during the talk.

Dialogue and interaction comprise an increasingly broader circle of bilateral and global problems. There are certainly omissions, as well. There is still no active discussion of fundamental economic problems of the present, Shevardnadze said. Some discriminatory approaches have not yet been fully overcome. This is obviously a relapse of the past.

Both sides noted the intention to make intensive preparations for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States. The specific dates for the visit have now been agreed upon and announced. A major role in this respect will be played by the next round of negotiations between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state, planned for mid-May.

President Bush reaffirmed once again that the United States supported Soviet perestroyka and the efforts being exerted by Gorbachev to overcome the difficulties on its way.

Touching upoon Lithuania, Bush expressed hope for a peaceful solution of the problem through dialogue. Shevardnadze said that an "open, honest dialogue is the principled course, true to perestroyka ideals, being firmly followed by the leadership of the Soviet Union."

Shevardnadze told the U.S. President about some specific features of the situation in Lithuania and stressed the need to maintain normal public order there.

Shevardnadze's talk with U.S. President passed in a constructive, well-wishing atmosphere.

Moscow TV Reports Progress of Talks

LD0604183190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The visit Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze is paying to the United States continues. Let me remind you that the chief thing to come out of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Washington yesterday was an accord on specific dates for President Gorbachev's visit to the United States. It is to take place from 30 May to 3 June this year. This event is probably the number one subject in media comment on international affairs in various countries. A USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said at a briefing in Moscow today that the accord and the decision to make it public before the conclusion of the USSR foreign minister's talks in Washington is evidence of—and I am quoting—a serious and profound approach by the sides to the development of bilateral relations and to discussion of topical world problems.

In Washington now it is the middle of the day. Comrade Shevardnadze's visit is in full swing, and here to tell us how it is going today is our Washington correspondent Boris Kalyagin:

[Kalyagin] [video shows Shevardnadze and Bush descending White House steps and shaking hands] Today, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze had a meeting at the White House with U.S. President George Bush. It was noted with satisfaction that definite progress has been attained in many strands of Soviet-U.S. relations. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze handed President Bush a personal message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. [video shows brief shot of Shevardnadze in informal conversation with Baker: Shevardnadze entering building with other officials; various shots of delegation seated around a table at talks] Comrade Shevardnadze's talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker are continuing. They have discussed regional problems, as well as humanitarian, transnational, and economic questions, and also ways of further broadening Soviet-U.S. bilateral links. The leaders of the arms control groups reported to the ministers on the work they have done. [video shows Kalyagin speaking to camera, with White House in background]

The present Soviet-U.S. talks are coming to an end. Initially some U.S. observers had a somewhat pessimistic view of them, referring to the fact that the situation in Lithuania could hamper the successful preparation of a summit meeting. Assessments are now rather different. It is being noted that the Soviet and U.S. sides have reached agreement that the problem which has arisen from Lithuania's attempt to secede from the Soviet Union should be resolved through dialogue between Moscow and Vilnius. And, as is known, the summit meeting is to take place even earlier than had previously been indicated. As for other results of the talks, these will be described by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and James Baker at their final press conferences. When this takes place it will be the middle of the night in Moscow.

Shevardnadze Holds News Conference

PM0704195190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian Morning Edition 6 Apr 90 p 5

[TASS report: "E.A. Shevardnadze's News Conference"]

[Text] Washington, 7 Apr—E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR minister of foreign affairs, held a news conference on Friday at the U.S. State Department for Soviet and foreign journalists after completing his meetings in Washington. He said:

The talks between ministers and the conversation with U.S. President George Bush, which have taken place in the last few days in Washington, have in a concrete way marked the coming major landmark in the developing Soviet-U.S. political dialogue. The dates for the visit by M.S. Gorbachev, the USSR president, to the United States have been agreed: 30 May-3 June.

Such accords have at least three motives:

—the need to discuss the state of the two countries' mutual relations and the reciprocal desire to find the optimum balance of interests;

—the possiblity of obtaining practical results and solving certain problems that have an important significance from the point of view of each country's national policy goals;

—the necessity of establishing mutual understanding regarding the limits of cooperation and competition and methods for regulating their relations.

The exchange of opinions has revealed both sides see sufficient basis for holding a regular meeting of their top leaders.

In fact, significant changes, although on different levels, are taking place in the life of the Soviet Union and the United States. The world is changing around us and it is changing in a very important way. To adapt in the new environment our countries must know each other's intentions and take into consideration the direction the other side is moving. Otherwise, we may simply collide somewhere.

The course toward cooperation and collaboration, which we have jointly undertaken in recent times, is bearing fruit. We are finding points of contact and coming to serious accords, which we need.

The summit meeting may bring us to draw up extremely important agreements on strategic offensive weapons as well as on conventional ones and be a major step in the process of banning nuclear tests, building confidence and developing cooperation in many areas and spheres of our relations.

In present conditions as never before we need predictability regarding the actions of our countries on the international arena and their behavior in one situation or another.

The achievement of an accord on the time for holding the summit meeting is evidence in the present conditions of nonopportunistic [nekonyunkturnyy] development of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue and the continuation of the course, firm agaisnt fluctuations, caused by rapidly changing world conditions.

In such conditions the developing Soviet-U.S. dialogue is an unconditional factor of stability and carries a sufficiently weighty chance of agreed positive influence on potentially destructive processes in various regions of the world.

When two powers such as the Soviet Union and the United States of America continue to increase their cooperation even in complicated times, the world lives more calmly, with more confident hope in a way out of diffiuclt situations.

Our resolve to hold the meeting also signifies the mutual adherence, clearly expressed, to the principles of the new thinking and to the idea of the supremity of political ways over all others.

As you undoubtedly know the coming summit meeting, in both sides' opinion, must advance us significantly toward the signing of agreements on radical cuts in strategic offensive weapons. So this time as well questions connected to the development of an agreement on strategic offensive weapons were at the center of our attention.

I will not hide the fact that here in Washington we ran into certain difficulties when discussing these questions. Neither side is dramatizing them. We know from experience that such things happen at the concluding stages of negotiations. For in our work we have come to the point where it is necessary to conceive very precisely what lies behind one or other version and what are the consequences for the interests of national security. It is necessary to make difficult choices. It is namely these which remain on the concluding stage of the negotiations which we have now begun.

Speaking of the Soviet position, I should say it is to a growing extent being determined now by considerations connected with the need to ensure ratification of a future treaty in the country's parliament. I will say frankly that neither we nor our partners are as yet wholly accustomed to this. It is a fact, however, that now both we and the United States are in an equal position in this respect. When this factor came to light certain complexities and difficult problems arose. What is needed here is adaptation on both sides to the new conditions. On the other hand, there will then be the certainty that the agreement we hammer out will be a solid one. I think at the next ministerial meeting, which by mutual accord is due to be held in the middle of May—more precisely 16-19 May—we will be able to overcome the greater part of the difficulties and find mutually acceptable options regarding the outstanding unresolved issues concerned with a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

Fortunately, we have not lost optimism and confidence here; that is the main thing.

Another reason we have not lost it is that we have been able to do some very hopeful work on all the other points on our agenda, all without exception.

We are pleased with the very great progress achieved with respect to our actions for banning and eliminating chemical weapons.

The question of the protocols to the 1974 and 1976 treaties relating to nuclear explosions are in essence ready for the summit.

Discussions on bilateral relations are proving very productive, in this area we have practical accords and a large amount of work for the future has been embarked upon.

What I am referring to here are a dozen or so new intergovernmental agreements and other bilateral accords, on which experts are working most intensively.

It would be premature to give the names of the documents under preparation. However, one can say the range of areas they cover is vivid evidence of the breadth of our two countries' mutual interests.

The secretary of state and I have voiced satisfaction at the way the line for deepening and diversifying bilateral contacts, exchanges and cooperation—a line adopted by the leadership of the USSR and the United States—is being implemented.

A working program of actions in the bilateral sphere spanning the period up to the summit has been agreed on the basis of the outcome of the discussion.

Cooperation in the humanitarian field, in matters concerning human rights and in comparing the practice of our states in dealing with a number of specific issues is developing confidently.

A fruitful discussion has been held on transnational problems. They are a relatively new question on our agenda, encompassing the most varied spheres—joint action in the United Nations, ecology, the Arctic and Antarctic, space, the world's oceans, countering international terrorism and illegal drug dealing, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Among problems acknowledged to require priority attention are those of global climatic change and the preservation of the world's biological variety. Understanding has been attained on the need to make a practical examination of the question of setting up a Soviet-U.S. ecological association.

The two countries' joint activities in environmental protection in the Arctic and the North and in establishing scientific cooperation in this region have been noted with satisfaction. In the coming days special bilateral consultations are to be held on problems concerning the struggle against terrorism, at which a program for further practical cooperation in preventing any manifestations of this will be worked out. It has also been agreed to work for broader cooperation on preventing, treating, and curing drug addiction and on eliminating illegal drug production and dealing.

The two sides have confirmed their desire for a substantial broadening of the scale of bilateral cooperation in space research and the use of space for peaceful purposes. It is expected that a corresponding accord will have been worked out in time for the summit.

Special note was made of the growing role of cooperation between the USSR and the United States in helping to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations Organization on the basis of a multi-measure approach to the system of peace, security, and cooperation.

Discussions of regional problems have, in our opinion, gone well. If we were speaking the American's language, I would say we are all playing in the same ballpark now. We are convinced our cooperation in this field will be of benefit both to our peoples and to the world as a whole.

The set of issues relating to the situation in Europe was examined in detail, primarily from the angle of preserving and strengthening stability on the continent.

The sides set forth in a spirit of frankness [otkrovennyy] their ideas on the settlement of the foreign aspects of building German unity and on the tasks arising in connection with this to face those taking part in the "two plus four" negotiating mechanism. Discussion also dealt with the necessity for a staged synchronizing of the formation of pan-German structures with the Helsinki process, which would facilitate finding a response to the legitimate concerns of European, and indeed, other states, a response acceptable to everyone.

I would like to note with satisfaction that we have a common understanding of the need for the present German borders to be enshrined in international law.

At the same time, it should be acknowledged that our positions differ on a number of very important matters, primarily that of the military and political status of a future Germany. We were not convinced by the arguments put before us in favor a united Germany's being included in NATO. We indicated the one-sidedness of this approach and spoke in favor of a qualitatively new system of security in Europe by means of a sequential transformation of the mlitary-political alliances and subsequent emergence at non-bloc collective structures. A future Germany would take its place, along side the other states, within that system.

We made a careful analysis of the state of affairs at the Vienna talks. A good deal has been done there, without doubt. Essentially, the framework for a future agreement has been prepared. The columns supporting it are the accords relating to six categories of conventional armed forces, which are to be covered by the reductions. These are personnel, airplanes, helicopters, tanks, armored vehicles and artillery, that is all those types of the armed forces the Soviet Union has proposed including in the agreement since the very beginning. On the question of aircraft we proposed thinking about an alternative approach which would remove many current difficulties: that of setting an equal level for USSR and U.S. warplanes outside their national territories in Europe of, for example, 500 on each side. The remaining issues pertaining to aircraft could be held over for the next stage of the talks.

It goes without saying that all these questions were discussed while bearing in mind that the Vienna talks are multilateral and that decisions at these talks must be found collectively by all those taking part.

Overall we believe that the talks in Washington have been an important and successful step forward in preparing for both the summit agenda and those agreements which could be adopted at it and signed.

We have also agreed that in the seven weeks that remain the pace of our joint work will be stepped up considerably.

In conclusion, I would like to express my thanks to the leadership of the State Department and Secretary of State Mr. J. Baker for the fine way in which they have organized our talks.

E.A. Shevardnadze answered questions from the journalists present.

Shevardnadze Fields Questions

PM0904091390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report on question and answer session at press conference given by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze 7 April in Washington under the general heading: "E.A. Shevardnadze's News Conference"]

[Text] Washington, 7 Apr—E.A. Shevardnadze answered questions from the journalists present.

Question (AP): Mr. Minister, could you set out in greater detail your concept of new security structures for Europe? There is every indication that during your talks with Secretary of State Baker you touched on the question of the military alliances' so-called "new mission." Do you mean that NATO and the Warsaw Pact should cease to exist as military alliances and that their role should be fundamentally revised? In general, how do you see their role in the new Europe and what specifically is meant by "new security structures" for the European Continent?

Answer: I cannot name a single politician in Europe or indeed in the world who has readymade prescriptions for resolving this exceptionally complex problem of the day. However, I believe that we must be guided by the following considerations.

First, it is a matter of unconditionally eliminating military confrontation in Europe; this is the most important condition for overcoming the split in Europe—both political and, if you will, economic.

Second, we think that the time has come for European states (when I say European states, I mean both the United States and Canada as well) to embark in earnest on the formation of all-European security structures.

In my view, it would be right to talk about Europe now as greater Europe. An all-European council comprising the heads of the CSCE states and meeting at least once a year could be the nucleus of its structures. A committee of foreign ministers convened at specific intervals for special or scheduled sittings could also be formed as a working organ.

We consider the question of organizing a center to avert military danger to be promising. Similar proposals have also been made by my other colleagues, Mr. Genscher in particular. The material and technical base for such a center exists. Namely the military-political alliances, if they are transformed into political-military alliances, and the four powers' current military liaison missions in West Berlin. The time has come for Europeans to embark on serious work to form all-European security structures. A decision to form such structures could be adopted either at the meeting of the top leaders of the European countries, the United States, and Canada which it is planned to hold this year, or during the meeting scheduled for 1992.

Question (UPI): How would you define the main areas of disagreement at the talks to elaborate a treaty on strategic offensive arms reductions?

Answer: I do not want to name specific areas of disagreement now because the quest for compromise approaches, along with work to overcome these disagreements, is continuing. You cannot avoid mutual compromises in the final stages of negotiations. We have agreed with our colleagues not to publicly focus attention on unresolved questions now. I have no doubt that mutually acceptable solutions can be found in the time remaining. Although I stress once again that there are still problems—and extremely complex problems.

Question (THE WASHINGTON POST): U.S. Administration officials have recently intimated increasingly clearly that Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole are being jeopardized as a result of the Soviet Government's actions with regard to Lithuania. My question is as follows: Do you believe that Soviet-U.S. relations are or could be jeopardized as a result of your actions in Lithuania? And one more thing: How do the views expressed in the United States and other states affect your policy toward Lithuania?

Answer: We are profoundly convinced that it is necessary to seek and find a common language and conduct dialogue—constant dialogue—and on this basis resolve all the complex issues which have arisen as a result of the Lithuanian parliament's well known decision. We have no intention other than to resolve this by peaceful means. I see no grounds for a deterioration in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Both the President and the secretary of state asked me questions about Lithuania today—on several occasions—and we held quite a long conversation about them. I can understand this concern. We will seek a peaceful solution fully consonant with the interests of both the Lithuanian people and the entire Soviet country—without fail within the framework of our constitution and laws.

I consider the disquiet regarding a possible deterioration in Soviet-U.S. affairs to be unfounded.

Question (ARAB AMERICAN MEDIA SERVICE): Could you tell us whether your opinions coincided with the Americans' views on certain regional problems? Particularly in the light of the tension that has arisen in the Near East over chemical weapons? In particular, regarding Iraq's threat against Israel? Iraq's foreign minister recently said that Iraq could destroy Israel with its chemical weapons. What can you say on this score?

Answer: I would like to express my regret as to everything pertaining to statements or threats to make practical use of chemical weapons.

Dialogue on a Near East settlement is proceeding in an interesting manner. We support all the positive elements here, including the idea of possible contacts between the Palestinians and Israeli representatives.

We also told the secretary of state that it would be a good thing to step up our efforts in other areas, in particular, to begin consultations on a Near East settlement within the framework of the "Five," that is, with the participation of the permanent members of the Security Council, to promote the idea of convening a Near East conference, and to ask the UN secretary general to speed up the resolution of the question of appointing a special representative for the Near East.

Question (NBC TV): Allow me to come back to the subject of Germany once again. If its membership of NATO is unacceptable to the Soviet Union, can you imagine a situation where the military alliance is in operation but Germany does not hold an independent position within it? And, furthermore, why does the Soviet Union not recognize the fact that an independent Germany may pose a threat to it?

Answer: There may be totally different scenarios. But as yet there are no readymade proposals; we have said what we find unacceptable. That is a united Germany being a member of NATO.

Various opinions have been voiced on this score. Including quite unusual ones. For instance, the idea of a united Germany's dual membership of NATO and the Warsaw Pact was put forward recently. That is perhaps unexpected, naive even, but it does provide food for thought.

You said: an "independent Germany." I would prefer to talk about a neutral, neutralized, or demilitarized Germany, as once enshrined in the postwar agreements. Then this question—Germany's membership of military-political blocs—would not arise today. The "Six" will meet at the level of experts in a few days, after the formation of the GDR Government. This meeting will be followed by a conference involving the six states' foreign ministers. We will seek mutually acceptable solutions.

Question (EFE): During the talks did you discuss the question of the USSR using its influence in Central America to stop weapons shipments there? Are you prepared to use your influence to improve the political situation in Cuba? Will an accord on this score be secured at the summit meeting?

Answer: We said that Central America is a good example of Soviet-U.S. cooperation. We promoted to a considerable extent the implementation of the national reconciliation policy in Nicaragua. The Sandinist leadership proved equal to the situation in this respect. We and the United States both respect the results of the free elections in Nicaragua.

The Soviet Union has not supplied weapons to this region for a long time now. We propose beginning serious discussion of the question of defensive sufficiency in Central America. The states of this and other regions should have as many weapons and armed forces as are needed for defense alone.

As for the situation in Cuba, I do not see any reasons for concern here. As far as I am aware, the situation in this country is stable, its leaders and people have great plans, and we wish them success in implementing them.

Question (NEWSWEEK): Yesterday your spokesman said that he did not know that the Soviet Union had transferred SS-23 missiles to the GDR, Bulgaria, and Czechoslovakia. Did you and M.S. Gorbachev know about this and, if not, what degree of control do you have over your military's actions?

Answer: I would like to clarify the essence of your question: In the case in question we are talking about the transfer of missiles without nuclear charges. This happened before the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles was signed, and there is documentary evidence to prove this. As for being informed, I can say with the utmost responsibility that M.S. Gorbachev did not know about this. Nor did I. But I would like to stress once again that in this specific instance it is a question of something that happened before the treaty was signed.

Question (HIGHLIGHTS AND LOWLIGHTS): From the viewpoint of the agenda for the coming Soviet-U.S. summit, what trade and economic questions are of interest to the Soviet Union? What is the current status of the question of the Soviet ruble's partial convertibility? There are still complaints that foreign companies cannot take income out of your country. What is being done about this?

Answer: There is identical mutual interest in our bilateral relations, including our economic and trade relations. This is, of course, also being taken into consideration in preparing for the meeting.

With regard to the questions you have raised, I will say that a vast amount of legislative work is currently under way in our country and economic reforms are being implemented. The Soviet economy is adapting gradually, step by step, to world norms of trade and economic cooperation, including to the standards that operate within the GATT system. But this is not a simple process. I do not know how long it will take us to complete this complex work. I will only point out that we are extremely interested in speeding up the pace of change and implementing these reforms.

Question (REUTER): You seem to be refusing to clarify the question about the state of preparations for the strategic offensive arms treaty. If, as you have said, some "unexpected problems" have arisen during the talks, what are they?

Answer: I did not say that problems have arisen "unexpectedly." On the contrary, I said that we are not surprised that problems have arisen: They are natural at the closing stages of complex talks. I would prefer to take the following approach to this question: When the secretary of state pays a return visit to the Soviet Union, we will sum up the results of our joint work to prepare a strategic offensive arms agreement. If it turns out that we are unable to reach agreement on certain questions even then, I will tell you what they are.

Question (BBC): I would like you to clarify your stance regarding the establishment of a direct air link between Moscow and Israel. If you receive guarantees that emigres from the Soviet Union will not be settled on the occupied territories, will this result in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel?

Answer: I would not link this question with the restoration of diplomatic relations. The problem of direct air links will indeed be settled if the Israeli authorities give the requisite guarantees that citizens leaving the USSR will not be settled on the occupied territories and if they honestly fulfill the decisions adopted at UN level.

Question (THE BOSTON GLOBE): Today, following your meeting with President Bush, you said that some administrative measures will obviously have to be taken in Lithuania to contain the conflict. What did you have in mind?

Answer: When I spoke of administrative measures, I was referring to actions by the militia—your country calls it the police—and other organs which must ensure normal living conditions in any city and any village.

Question (ABC TV): How do you regard the U.S. proposal on holding democratic elections in such countries as Afghanistan and Angola?

Answer: We are not prepared to give an exhaustive answer on Angola now, since I do not know the stance held by this country's leadership. I had a meeting recently with President dos Santos. He himself raised this question. I think that the Angolan leadership is pondering these problems. What decision is taken is their prerogative.

As for free elections in Afghanistan, that is not a new idea. President Najibullah proposed this at the conference of the nonaligned countries in Belgrade. I myself have had a meeting with him. I know the Afghan president's stance. He is willing to help hold free elections in Afghanistan, although this problem is very complex and will undoubtedly require substantial efforts from the United Nations. The world has experience of this. The most recent—and, in my opinion, very successful—example of this were the elections in Namibia and in Nicaragua, which were held with the help and support of the United Nations and under UN control.

Thank you very much.

Baker Comments at News Conference

LD0704161690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] U.S. Secretary of State Baker held a press conference on completion of his talks with the Soviet minister. Commenting that during the talks all the points on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations were discussed, Baker said: We have done a great deal of work. However, it should be said that both Minister Shevardnadze and I are agreed that there is still a great deal to do over the remaining weeks before the summit meeting.

Baker described the discussion of the issue of Lithuania as very serious and frank. He reiterated the United States' well-known position on nonrecognition of the inclusion of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia into the USSR. However, at the same time he pointed out—I quote—I think it is quite obvious that there is a whole series of extremely difficult issues which demand solution, even after self-determination has been declared in some form or another. There are the most diverse economic ties. Furthermore, there are questions of territory and borders: What constituted the territory of Lithuania in 1941, and what comes into the Lithuanian Republic today.

Shevardnadze Assesses Talks

LD0704192890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze by correspondent Boris Kalyagin; in Washington on 6 April—recorded, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Kalyagin] After the Soviet-U.S. talks, Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze held a news conference at the U.S. State Department. During his introductory statement, Comrade Shevardnadze remarked that the Washington talks had been an important and productive step forward in preparing the agenda for the summit meeting and for the agreements that may be reached at it. The minister announced that in order to complete the preparations for the summit, he would be holding more talks with the U.S. secretary of state, on 16-19 May in the Soviet Union.

That same day, Comrade Shevardnadze received Senator Edward Kennedy, the well-known U.S. politician, in the USSR's Washington embassy. Issues relating to the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit were discussed, as were the prospects for expanding Soviet-U.S. relations. The Lithuanian situation was also touched on.

Before flying home, Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze gave an interview for Soviet Television:

Eduard Amvrosyevich, during your meeting with Mr. Baker in Wyoming, a formula was put forward to describe the trend in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations: from mutual understanding to mutual action. How do you feel. Have the past six months confirmed this formula as correct?

[Shevardnadze] The time that has elapsed since Wyoming has proved that it is a viable formula. There are very many specific examples. If you take regional problems, for instance, there is the mutual understanding and mutual action over a Central American settlement; there are the results of the free elections in Nicaragua, results that are respected by the United States, the Soviet Union, and all states, not least the neighboring states, and results that are respected by the Sandinists, too. Their role undoubtedly was decisive in having free elections. We can speak, too, of our mutual action in southern Africa, especially now, when the question of a settlement in Angola is so acute. The implementation of the national reconciliation policy in Mozambique is likewise very topical. I would particularly single out the opportunity for our two countries to work together in resolving the problem of how to eliminte apartheid. This is the problem of the century, and it is ripe for resolution. The secretary of state and I had a lengthy chat about this, both in Namibia and here in Washington.

[Kalyagin] Are you satisfied with the results of these talks?

[Shevardnadze] In principle, I am satisfied with the outcome of these talks. They really have been very substantive—not just lengthy, but substantive, too,—which is the main thing. We have succeeded in covering essentially the whole range, a very wide range, of issues that are of interest to both of us. The bulk of attention was devoted to disarmament problems, and to preparations for the well-known agreement on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive weapons. We agreed both with the secretary of state, and in principle, with the U.S. President to embark on more intensive work in order to have these documents and agreements ready for the summit meeting.

[Kalyagin] Did the situation in and around Lithuania have a bearing on the talks?

[Shevardnadze] I would not say it has had an influence. Naturally, questions connected with the events in Lithuania were asked. Such a question also was asked by the President, who was interested. Indeed, he showed specific interest. Also, the secretary of state and journalists, and simply on the streets and when you talk with people, there were many questions, but I would not say that there was some kind of unhealthy interest.

Here, there is a certain disquiet. Perhaps elements of disinformation are also present here. Such a factor is operating, but the discussions of all questions, including this one, of this problem, on the events in Lithuania, proceeded in a completely normal atmosphere.

[Kalyagin] But are new shifts for the better in Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations plannned?

[Shevardnadze] There are serious such shifts, very serious shifts. Perhaps this next summit meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich and President Bush will be, I would say, a turning point in bilateral relations. Good prospects are emerging for signing a trade agreement. There has been important work done on an agreement on investment. More than 10 agreements on bilateral cooperation in the sphere of science and technology, in the cultural field, the formation of cultural centers, and much else—this is a whole complex—a great deal of work has been done. I think it will be the first meeting during which we manage to sign some very important agreements. I would say of fundamental importance for our country.

Shevardnadze Departs for Moscow

LD0704014590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0127 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Washington, 7 Apr (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs, on Friday evening left the U.S. capital for Moscow. He was here on a working visit at the invitation of U.S. Secretary of State James Baker.

He was seen off at the Andrews Air Force Base by Raymond Seitz, the U.S. assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian affairs, and other U.S. officials. Among those seeing him off was Yuriy Dubynin, the USSR ambassador in the United States and Jack Matlock, the U.S. ambassador in the Soviet Union.

Bush, Baker Cited on Talks With Shevardnadze

PM0904101990 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 8 Apr 90 p 3

[TASS report: "After the Talks"]

[Text] Washington, 7 Apr—U.S. President George Bush addressed the congress of the American Society of Newspaper Editors on Friday. Inter alia, he touched on his meeting that morning with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze in the White House.

Speaking about Soviet-U.S. dialogue, G. Bush said: "We want—and we believe that the Soviet side also wants this—to make further progress in U.S.-USSR relations, in the human rights sphere, and in settling regional problems. We are elaborating important agreements in the arms control sphere. I asked him (E.A. Shevardnadze—TASS note) to tell President Gorbachev that I am impatiently awaiting his visit to the United States at the end of May. Now is an important time for debate and dialogue."

The U.S. President noted that during his meetings with E.A. Shevardnadze the question of Lithuania was broached: "I reiterated the United States' firm opinion that this question must be settled peacefully," Bush said.

That same evening at the close of the talks with USSR foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker addressed a news conference here.

After pointing out that all points on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations were discussed during the talks, J. Baker said: "We covered a great deal of ground. However, it must be said that both Minister Shevardnadze and I agree that a great deal still has to be done in the remaining weeks before the summit meeting."

In the arms control sphere, the secretary of state said, "we made definite progress on a number of strategic offensive arms questions, conventional arms, chemical weapons, nuclear tests, and nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and missiles. However, more work still has to be done in all these areas."

"As for regional conflicts," Baker said, "in my opinion, we had fewer differences of opinion on a number of questions. I am glad that we agreed that elections are an important mechanism for solving regional conflicts."

"We had a detailed discussion of the humans rights sphere and economic problems," the secretary of state continued. "We examined the question of how we can further develop our technical cooperation projects. We focused our attention on how we can complete the elaboration of a trade agreement in time for the summit."

"As for the German problem, I stressed the importance of a united Germany's joining NATO, since this is a guarantee of stability," J. Baker said, pointing out that the Soviet side disagreed with him.

The U.S. secretary of state described as "very serious and frank" the discussion of the question of Lithuania. Baker reiterated the United States' well-known position regarding its nonrecognition of the incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia within the USSR, but he also indicated the following: "I think it is quite obvious that there is a whole series of very, very difficult questions that need to be solved even after self-determination is somehow declared. There are most diverse economic ties. What is more, there are questions of territory and borders—what was Lithuanian territory in 1940 and what is part of the Lithuanian republic today."

When asked to voice his attitude to the development of the CSCE process, the U.S. secretary of state said: "I have called for the CSCE process to be reinforced and have, moreover, voiced the opinion that inadequate use has been made of some of its spheres, such as, for instance, the economic sphere... We now have proposals on all three CSCE 'baskets,' particularly in the economic and human rights spheres. I think that we should somewhat slow down the advance in the security sphere... We do not want the CSCE to supplant NATO functions. That is the U.S. stance."

IZVESTIYA on Shevardnadze U.S. Talks

PM0904113190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Nadein: "Good Thing It Wasn't Worse"]

[Text] Washington— E.A. Shevardnadze's three days of talks took place in an anxious atmosphere. On the eve of the visit the U.S. Government was subjected to serious pressure in connection with the situation over Lithuania. Not only senators and congressmen but also a number of eminent ministers made it clear that they do not share their President's approach and would prefer to discuss the problem from tough positions. To judge by the numerous statements in the press and on television only the Bush-Baker twosome prevented a transition to the language of threats: It was being said that Lithuania's freedom should not be sacrificed for the sake of maintaining long-term relations with M.S. Gorbachev.

Addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors immediately after his meeting with E. Shevardnadze, President Bush indirectly replied to this criticism. He said that he had informed Moscow of how far arms control and other items on the Soviet-U.S. agenda are subject to the influence of the Lithuanian situation. He deemed it necessary, however, to add immediately: "An awful lot in Soviet-U.S. relations has been put at risk, an incredible amount of everything. That applies to arms control, to human rights, to the emigration of Soviet Jews. That applies to regional questions. And these are the main relations affecting the lives of people throughout the world."

"After a series of three summit meetings in six months marked by dramatic steps in the field of cooperation, officials on both sides described the talks this week as disappointing," THE WASHINGTON POST sums up the first results today.

"Disappointment" is a word from the statement by Secretary of State J. Baker. But it concerned only one position standing on the path of strategic arms agreements. To wit: limitations of sea-launched and air-launched cruise missiles.

The U.S. newspapers have also noted a trace of disappointment on this subject in the Soviet minister's speech. "I shall not conceal from you," they quote E. Shevardnadze's words at the press conference, "that we were surprised to encounter certain difficulties and certain problems."

In the opinion of one high-ranking official in the U.S. delegation whom observers here quote without naming, this happened because the Soviet Union retreated from a number of positions in connection with cruise missiles, on which a mutual accord was allegedly reached during J. Baker's previous visit to Moscow 7-9 February this year.

But some members of the Soviet delegation with whom I talked deny the "sudden toughening of position" ascribed to it. They believe that it is exclusively a case of equality in the use of means and results of verification.

The substantiated nature of this approach was reflected in the statements by the heads of the two delegations. "Both Baker and Shevardnadze," THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "expressed the hope that they will be able to find a way out of the impasse over arms control during the next meeting scheduled for 16-19 May in the Soviet Union—as it happens two weeks before Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev arrives in Washington for the summit meeting."

The definitive setting of the dates for this visit sets a precise businesslike schedule for preparing a package of accords. It is already clear today that agreements in the field of chemical weapons limitations, nuclear tests, and the nonproliferation of nuclear missile arms are at a high degree of preparedness.

A number of problems which sound different as set forth by the two delegations also deserve attention. This applies not only to Lithuania, about which the Soviet minister stated clearly that it is an internal problem for our country which the USSR intends to resolve through dialogue and by peaceful means.

"The State Department has made it known unofficially that Shevardnadze signaled an important shift in Moscow's position on the German question," THE WASHINGTON POST writes today. "There are indications that the Soviet Union will not insist on a united Germany being a neutral country."

But E. Shevardnadze has expressed the Soviet position absolutely unambiguously, calling the option of a united

Germany's membership of NATO "unacceptable to us." Indeed, he added that the question needs further thought.

Observers here note that the progress of the talks in a different atmosphere could be more substantial. And although the first commentaries are not as optimistic as they have been in the past, of itself the retained prospect of the further improvement of relations attests that the spirit of Malta is standing the test of time.

TASS Notes U.S. Views on Shevardnadze Visit

LD0704101390 Moscow TASS in English 0957 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Washington April 7 TASS—The Washington talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker marked a new landmark in Soviet-American political dialogue.

Summing up the results of the recent talks, the U.S. news agencies Associated Press and United Press International are quoting the words of the Soviet foreign minister that the forthcoming summit between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush will become a major event in world politics and that it will produce important documents, including those in the field of disarmament.

During his Friday meeting with Eduard Shevardnadze, President Bush stressed the vital importance of Soviet-American relations. He said that the Soviet Union and the United States had problems, including Lithuania, and added that the United States was determined to settle the existing problems of arms control and move further in this process. Eventually, the United States is recognising the changes in Europe and agrees with the Soviet Union that stability is necessary there, he said.

According to a political observer, the summit scheduled for May 30-June 3 may bring the two countries to working out extremely important agreements on strategic offensive and conventional arms and may be a major step in banning nuclear tests, strengthening trust and developing cooperation in many spheres of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Special attention is being called to the fact that in the current situation the agreement reached on the time of the summit proves that the Soviet Union and the United States continue developing dialogue and pursuing the course resistible to all vibrations that may be caused by the quickly changing international situation.

When powers like the United States and the Soviet Union continue promoting cooperation in difficult periods, it is safer for the world to live and realise that there is hope that a way out of difficult situations could be found.

The two countries' determination to hold a summit indicates mutual adherence to the principles of new political thinking and the idea of superiority of political means over all the other ones.

The CBS T.V. company emphasised that during the summit the sides would try to initial an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons, although a great deal of work is yet to be done.

The sides discussed the situation in Europe, particularly from the point of view of preserving and strengthening the stability of the continent. The observers emphasise that the sides were sincere in settling the foreign aspects of the German problem. The U.S. mass media point out that the two countries have a common understanding of the need to legally fix the present German borders.

Less than two months are left till the summit's beginning, and the Soviet-American talks in Washington were a major and resultative step in preparing and working out agreements that may be signed during the forthcoming summit.

Moscow TV Views Shevardnadze's U.S. Visit

LD0804104590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 7 Apr 90

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] Hello, comrades. The working visit of the Soviet foreign minister to Washington and his talks with the American leaders, as was expected, have become an important event of the past days. This is all the more the case because this is one more stage in preparation for the Soviet-American summit meeting.

From the range of questions which were discussed we will draw attention in this International Panorama to aspects of disarmament. In Washington they also talked about accelerating the Vienna negotiations on conventional weapons and on the preparation of documents on the cutting of strategic offensive weapons.

Besides the obvious importance of the process itself, disarmament issues have become a barometer of the common attitude of the West to changes in the Soviet Union and East Europe, on the one hand, and on the other, such changes indisputably influence the formation of U.S. military and budgetary policy. For the United States this is extremely topical, since American legislators are debating their country's military budget for next year.

The administration is inclined to cut the original sum of $306,000 million. About two months ago the curtailment figure of $3,000 million was mentioned, but recently the sum mentioned has been three times as much—more than $10,000 million.

Many U.S. officials consider that the Soviet military threat is weakening under the pressure of reforms and that the Warsaw Pact is losing its energy. Even Webster, the CIA director, has expressed this opinion. True, his debate with Defense Secretary Cheney has split public opinion. The defense secretary imagines that the process of democratization in the countries of East Europe could be thrown into reverse, and that the Soviet Union could again present a threat to American interests. The defense secretary demands that the large allocations for bombers, land-based missiles, and submarines—the well-known American triad—be maintained. In short, as THE WASHINGTON POST has remarked on the subject of disarmament: Bush administration officials are both glad and afraid.

But time can crack a nut even as hard as that of disarmament. The problem of the conversion of military production has matured in the United States. From our own experience we can see that this is no simple matter. It concerns not just an industrial reorientation, but human destinies, too, both here in our country and in America.

IZVESTIYA Notes Summit Date Announced

PM0904093390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondents A. Blinov and S. Dardykin dispatch under the "Panorama of International Events" rubric: "Date of Meeting Set"]

[Text] Washington,—So USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President G. Bush will hold their summit 30 May-3 June in the United States.

This news, which was announced simultaneously Thursday in Moscow and Washington, "compensated" journalists covering the current talks in Washington between Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker for their long hours of waiting in the lobby of the State Department building.

Naturally the announcement of the precise date of the summit meeting was immediately televised and a few hours later hit the front pages of U.S. newspapers. A lengthy WASHINGTON POST article did not hide its disappointment at the lack of additional detail. For instance, where precisely in the United States M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush will meet. U.S. officials were heard to surmise that it would be held in Washington and possibly somewhere outside. The President's out-of-town residence in Camp David is a possibility. However, all this is just Washington rumor. All the details still have to be officially agreed. This also applies to the agenda for the talks between the two heads of state, which, the Soviet side said, has not yet been worked out either.

That very day literally the first authoritative assessments were also made of the significance of the coming event. U.S. President G. Bush, who was receiving the highly popular American singer Michael Jackson at the White House on the occasion of the latter's being awarded the title "Artist of the Decade," said in response to a question from expectant journalists: "I am very glad that the date has been set. It is extremely important for us to hold these talks. Dialogue is important."

While the U.S. President was voicing this opinion, talks were continuing at the State Department between E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Baker. At the close of the latest round in their exchange of opinions, they addressed journalists according to tradition. The conversation naturally turned to preparations for the summit. It was stressed that a great amount of preparatory work still has to be done in the comparatively short time remaining until the meeting—seven weeks. Incidentally, it was made known that the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush will be preceded by another round of talks between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state. They will be held next month, this time in the Soviet Union.

Strictly speaking, the present conversations between the leaders of the diplomatic departments are also a crucial stage in the preparations for the coming summit talks. At the morning sitting with the participation of experts they discussed disarmament questions—which are still the main topic of Soviet-U.S. dialogue. In the afternoon regional problems were discussed. In the interim two briefings were held for journalists. The first, "conducted" by State Department spokesperson M. Tutwiler, took place with a whole team of high-ranking U.S. participants in the talks. The second was held by the Soviet delegation. The hall was full. Here, too, the first questions were about the summit meeting. In response to one of them, USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman G. Gerasimov pointed out that it will be a working, businesslike summit. Many people asked why this date had been chosen, after all, a later date—at the end of June—had been originally agreed. The Soviet side reminded journalists that, as CPSU Central Committee general secretary, M.S. Gorbachev will have to devote time to preparing for the upcoming party congress. The U.S. side greeted this fact with understanding.

The briefings touched on numerous other questions concerning Soviet-U.S. dialogue in general and the talks currently under way in Washington in particular. Perhaps the greatest interest was elicited by the following subject—how will the dialogue develop, specifically on disarmament questions, after the planned treaty on a 50-percent cut in strategic offensive arms is signed this year. Both sides pointed out that this is part of the current discussions. The Soviet and U.S. viewpoints on this question do not yet fully coincide. An agreement obviously still has to be reached on the subject and aims of the future talks.

Text of Gorbachev Interview on Summit Published

PM0804163090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev by unnamed PRAVDA correspondent: "USSR President

M.S. Gorbachev's Answers to PRAVDA Correspondent"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] Question: The date of your visit to the United States has been announced, our readers are very interested in this. Could you tell us what you expect of your coming meeting with President G. Bush?

Answer: Life has shown that Soviet-U.S. summit meetings are a very important element in world politics. During frank conversations both states' positions and interests emerge more clearly. A quest is under way to combine them with the interests of other countries and the world community—in the context, of course, of the relevant views of the world and the problems facing it.

President G. Bush and I have developed quite good mutual understanding. I am counting on a thorough, free discussion and on broadening the sphere of trust in USSR-U.S. relations.

The president and I must sum up the results of our work since Malta and reach definite accords, above all on questions of arms reduction and disarmament. The success of the meeting chiefly depends on this.

Question: What place will Europe hold in the talks?

Answer: An extremely important one. The most significant changes since World War II are currently taking place in Europe. Both the United States and the USSR are vigorous and influential participants in the all-European process. They also bear responsibility for ensuring that the incipient changes there, primarily German unification, proceed in a constructive manner, without harming anyone whatsoever, in the interests of all Europe and the world. It is a very crucial moment. The U.S. President and I have plenty to think about together.

Question: What new things are expected in the sphere of bilateral relations?

Answer: The summit meeting is a good opportunity to take another look at how the gap between words and actions could be narrowed on both sides, particularly in economic relations. Things are, alas, still going slowly, sluggishly.

'Top Priority' on Upcoming Summit With U.S.

LD0704200790 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 6 Apr 90

["Top Priority" program, presented by Sergey Goryachev, with Sergey Plekhanov, deputy director, and Andrey Kortunov, department head, both of the Institute of the United States and Canada]

[Text] [Goryachev] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen; welcome to Top Priority. I'm Sergey Goryachev. President Bush and President Gorbachev plan to hold their second summit meeting on 30th May to 3rd June. The news was announced simultaneously in Moscow and Washington during the ministerial meeting between the Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his American counterpart James Baker. I think it is the right time for us to review today Soviet-American relations and talk about what affects these relations and how. I have invited today Sergey Plekhanov, who is the deputy director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies in Moscow, and Andrey Kortunov, who is head of department at that same institute. Welcome.

[Plekhanov and Kortunov] Thank you.

[Goryachev] We talked about Lithuania in the last two of our programs, which was not exactly your cup of tea. Now I understand you have a lot to say about Soviet-American relations and I would like to start by asking you, Sergey, to tell us how do you think the political environment in the world has changed since the last summit between Gorbachev and Bush in Malta in December of 1989?

[Plekhanov] I think there have been stormy events—let me put it this way: I think the events in Europe have been stormier than the two leaders expected when they were talking amid a storm off Malta.

[Goryachev] Though they gathered there to discuss events in Europe, among other things.

[Plekhanov] That's right, that's right, but it was very difficult to look ahead farther than a week in a situation like the one that developed in Europe in the past year or so, but I think the relationship, the new relationship which is developing between the two countries, the United States and the Soviet Union, is pretty much on track. There are negotiations on a wide range of issues, from arms control to specific bilateral issues. The positions between the two countries in these areas are being worked out and are getting closer, and I think that the fact that there's this announcement of the date and that now the planning for the summit will enter a more practical stage, I think it's an indicator that the momentum which was reflected in the Malta meeting is continuing.

[Goryachev] Andrey Kortunov, would you join us in the discussion, and could you tell us what exactly in your view influenced Soviet-American relations recently in a positive way, and I mean the developments in the world or inside the two countries, and what made a negative effect on them?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that if you are speaking about positive factors, we should take into account first of all the recent developments in the Soviet Union. I think that now, when Gorbachev has become the president of the Soviet Union, Americans can feel more confident about his position within the country and more reliable to deal with. On the other hand, I think that another positive issue, and change in our country, is that our democracy is becoming more mature, so to say, and I think the probability that the events will be reversed is smaller now than just a couple of months ago. So I think that now Americans made up their minds to help Gorbachev and not just stay, you know, aside and look what he's doing. Speaking about negative events, again I think the situation in the Soviet Union has some negative also as well as positive impact, because it's a time of choices for all of us; all of us have to take some position vis-a-vis the situation in Lithuania, vis-a-vis the situation in Baltic states in general, and Americans are also in a position to make their choice.

[Goryachev] Sergey was speaking about the events in Europe, in Eastern Europe. Do you think these events have a positive effect on Soviet-American relations, or is it a destabilizing factor which put this relationship in danger?

[Plekhanov] I think the development of the German situation has made the whole game more complicated than expected. The push toward reunification of Germany has turned out to be stronger than people expected, and it is becoming clear that there is a divergence between the positions of the two sides, Soviet and American, on what the specific arrangements should be, security arrangements, for a reunited Germany. The American position is that a united Germany should be part of NATO; the Soviet position is that it should be neutral or at least it should continue to be under the tutelage of the two blocs in the transitional stage.

[Goryachev] Alright. Andrey mentioned developments in Lithuania; I think we should talk about that also, because these developments in this republic were high on the agenda during the ministerial meeting between Eduard Shevardnadze and Mr. Baker. And I would even say that topic was probably given too much attention there. So may I say that Americans are kind of pressing on the Soviet Union; may I say that they are playing the Lithuanian card, or am I wrong?

[Kortunov] Well I wouldn't say that at least the administration is playing the Lithuanian card. I think that they have shown that they understand the difficulties and the complexities of the situation, not just, you know, to take one side, let us say Lithuanian side and defend Lithuania against Moscow, against Gorbachev. I think that people in this administration understand that the situation is very comprehensive and, for example, if you are speaking about human rights, which is probably the most important issue in the Lithuanian situation, I think we should analyze not only the position of Moscow in this problem, but also the position of Lithuanian parliament itself, because in some aspects some legislation that has been adopted there cannot be regarded as human rights (?promoting) legislation, to put it mildly.

[Goryachev] Sergey, what's your position on that, I mean the relationship between developments in Lithiania and Soviet-American relations? American officials have expressed their concern more then once, and they kind of warned the Soviet Union that in case of any crackdown in Lithuania, this will have a negative effect on Soviet-American relations. How justifiable is that position?

[Plekhanov] Well, the Soviet position does not amount to, does not consist of only stressing that this is a Soviet internal problem. We recognize that there is legitimate concern abroad as to how the Lithuanian problem will be solved, and therefore it's proper for Soviet and American officials to discuss this matter. The question is what, how those discussions, how the views of the U.S. Government are translated into specific actions and some specific words. And I think that there've been a number of cases where the Soviet side felt that the Americans were going too far in their expressions of concern, and indeed there is an impression that some people in the United States, some people in Washington, would like to use the Lithuanian situation as a kind of a pressure lever on the Soviet Government, maybe trying to use it as a bargaining chip. It's unclear whether this is really happening or whether this is just static—you know, there are many voices in Washington, and 435 congressmen, members of congress, you know, each of them has his own or her own foreign policy, and there is a partisan angle to that, and so when you hear voices from Washington, it's not always clear as to which voices authentically reflect the official policy.

[Goryachev] OK, now let's talk about the timing of the coming Soviet-American summit in the United States. I think that a lot of people were kind of surprised by this timing; at least a lot of people were expecting, of course those who are watching closely the Soviet-American dialogue, were expecting the summit to be somewhere in mid-June. At a time when both Soviet and American officials indicate that it is very doubtful that any major arms control agreement can be reached or ready for signing by the announced summit, what do you think about the date? What is behind it?

[Plekhanov] Oh, there's always great use in a meeting between the Soviet and American leaders and the process of negotiations on arms reduction issues requires once in a while a push from the very top, authoritative decisions by the leaders in order to nudge the diplomats along. So we are talking about a very substantive set of issues in arms reduction, larger by far than any issues discussed before, and so if only for giving push to the arms reduction process it would be a very useful meeting. But there is also a whole range of other issues that can and should be discussed. We will see how the economic agreement, the trade and economic agreement, will be worked out, the process is on track, and it's reasonable to expect that there will be some kind of a trade and economic agreement found between the two sides, maybe to be signed in Washington. I do not rule out that possibility, even though one—it has to be recognized that in case there is an exacerbation of relations between the two countries, the agreement could become a point of, of...

[Goryachev, interrupting] Pressure.

[Plekhanov] ...and, you know, some events could prevent the two sides from completing it by the summit in Washington. So there is a whole menu of things to discuss for the two leaders, and the summits have become more regular and less dramatic, and I think it's healthy.

[Kortunov] Well, I would just add that—and if summer will be very hot for Gorbachev, and there'll be a lot of things to do in June and July just...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] At home.

[Kortunov] ...(?measures) at home just to prepare the congress of the Communist Party, which will probably be the last congress for the party, in its present form at least. And there are a lot of things to do in economic field, of course, and (?high) in the legislation. Therefore I think that probably this timing is better fitting into Gorbachev's schedule. Don't forget that he has not travelled abroad since he was elected the president of the Soviet Union.

[Goryachev] He was too busy here.

[Kortunov] Yes, it shows that it's really a very hot time for him, and probably, you know, I can speculate that his visit, if it is a successful visit, if the dialogue goes on and especially if there are any specific agreements in trade, can strengthen to some extent Gorbachev's postions at home, because he is emerging as a powerful international political leader, and I think it should be taken in account even by those who are criticizing his domestic record, so to say.

[Goryachev] I think what we see now is an evident impact on Soviet-American relationship by the domestic developments in both of our countries. We spoke about developments in the Soviet Union; let's talk about the United States. In the recent past, we've seen open disagreements about American policies towards the Soviet Union, between Mr. Webster, the chief of CIA, and Mr. Cheney, the defense minister. Now where do you think the wind is blowing in the administration? Sergey, probably you can talk about that.

[Plekhanov] Now it's very difficult to talk about that, because the details of the conversations in Washington between Bush and Shevardnadze are not yet clear, and that is the clearest indicator, that should be the clearest indicator, of which way the wind is blowing. So we will have to wait maybe until our next roundtable to ask about specifics, but my hunch is that the wind has been blowing from the right in the past few weeks, and that's because the hardliners have been using Lithuania in order to increase pressure on the Soviet Union...

[Kortunov, interrupting] One of the American senators—excuse me for interrupting you—one of the American senators is said to be planning a trip from Poland to Lithuania without having a Soviet entry visa, trying to check Soviet readiness to deal with Americans or whatever.

[Plekhanov] Well, that's a classic example of how one can behave in the old habit of challenging the Soviet Union and challenging the legitimacy of the Soviet Union as a state. I think it's very shortsighted, and I think that it's not going to have any significant impact on the relationship between the two countries.

[Goryachev] For decades we have seen each other as enemies, and I think that now this enemy image has vanished already, or is vanishing both on people-to-people level and on the governmental level, of course. What will be then the basis of our relationship in the future, and do you think that this warming-up is irreversible?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that in some aspects it is irreversible. The cold war is coming to an end. Of course, there can be a lot of problems, a lot of problems related to misperceptions, or the method changes in each of the two countries, and I think that certainly it will not be a paradise, but still I think that we are gradually moving to a more complicated world and probably the process of German reunification shows that now we see really the end of the classsic [words indistinct] structure of the cold war.

[Unidentified speaker] Yes.

[Kortunov] And I think both states, the Soviet Union and the United States, will have to take this into account, and both states are interested in making this change more gradual. You know, if, well, there are some arguments that now the Soviet Union and the United States will play a minor role in world politics, but at the moment I don't see any parties which can take the responsibilities for what is going [on] in the world. Their international mechanisms are not strong enough. For example, take the case of Europe. The Warsaw Treaty is eroding and so is NATO, though probably with less—not so fast, but still it is eroding and still their—all European institutions are too weak to just... to control the situation in different regions of Europe. So I think that for many years ahead, both the Soviet Union and the United States will have to take their share of responsibility for what is going on in Europe.

[Goryachev] Right, well you're optimistic.

[Kortunov] Well, you know, I have to be optimistic.

[Goryachev] Sergey, do you have to be optimistic, or are you?

[Plekhanov] I am optimistic. I'm convinced that the road toward improvements in Soviet-American relations will not be straight. It will involve difficult moments and differences and some conflicts; it's inevitable, that's part of life, but I think that our relationship has really entered a new phase last year. And in fact, the way the Lithuanian situation has affected U.S.-Soviet relations in the past few weeks is an indicator that we are at a new stage, because if the same things had been happening, say, two years ago, or even one year ago, I'm sure that the effect on the U.S.- Soviet relations would have been much, more stronger. It would have been a classic cold war chill on our relationship, but now that there is a greater mutual trust and greater mutual sensitivity to the problems that the other side faces—and there may be all kinds of problems—I think that we are at a stage where we can better manage our differences.

[Goryachev] Right, thank you very much. That was Top Priority, hosted today by Sergey Goryachev, and my guests were Sergey Plekhanov and Andrey Kortunov from the Institute of the United States and Canada Studies. Thank you for listening.

D'Amato Not Allowed Entrance Into Lithuania

LD0604232290 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Excerpt] Presenter Rima Yakutyte notes Senator Alfonse d'Amato was expected to arrive in Lithuania this evening. Unfortunately, the senator was not allowed entrance into Lithuania. His journey was terminated at about 1600 at the customs inspection station at the Polish-Lithuanian border. This was not unexpected. According to information given Vilnius Radio by Rimantas [name indistinct], chief of the Passport and Visa Section of the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the USSR will do everything to prevent the senator from coming to Vilnius.

According to our information, three U.S. senators have expressed the wish to come to Lithuania. They had been invited by the Lithuanian Supreme Council Presidium. Lithuania's Ministry of Foreign Affairs has confirmed the fact that the U.S. guests are officially invited and that the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been requested to issue visas for the senators.

Yesterday, Rimantas [name indistinct] received a telephone call from an official representative of the Consular Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who officially informed him that this question had been discussed at a considerably higher level than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The conclusion was reached that this type of trip was pointless, and visas will not be issued at this time.

The matter of the U.S. senators' visit to Lithuania, was most probably discussed at the Foreign Affairs Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Officials Invited to U.S. Consulate

LD0704225690 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] The three U.S. senators, who were refused entrance visas to Lithuania, are now in Leningrad and intend to invite next week Vytautas Landsbergis sand other Lithuanian leaders to the U.S. Consulate there. This was disclosed today at a news conference by the deputy chairman of the Lithuanian parliament Kazimieras Motkieta, who made reference to foreign sources and noted that the visit would be most probably unofficial.

At the news conference, foreign journalists asked about the reaction of Lithuanian authorities to the [word indistinct] of military helicopters during this day's rally in Vilnius. Vytautas Landsbergis defined it as a crime: First, the helicopters were hovering too low, endangering the safety of the people, and second, it was a means of terrorizing the Lithuanian nation. But at the same time, Vytautas Landsbergis noted, it was total discreditation of the USSR policies, of its armed forces and of the CPSU puppets in Lithuania.

West Europe

Agenda, Preparations for Visit by UK's Hurd

LD0604165790 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

The forthcoming visit to the USSR of British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, scheduled for April 9-12, will be an important landmark in this year's Anglo-Soviet political contacts. The agenda will include a meeting with President Gorbachev and official talks with his Soviet counterpart.

Chief of the Second European Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry Nikolay Uspenskiy told TASS that the visit would allow the sides to continue their bilateral dialogue on a wide range of European and world problems and to further promote Anglo-Soviet relations, which have developed dynamically in recent years. He noted that the visit was regarded as a milestone on the road to the Anglo-Soviet summit meeting, scheduled for June.

"The sides prepared for the visit in quite a new way," Uspenskiy noted. Working groups of experts on international affairs and bilateral relations were set up for the first time in the history of Anglo-Soviet contacts. They resemble the teams formed to prepare the Soviet-American summits.

Uspenskiy believes Anglo-Soviet political interaction on the international arena has brought tangible results in recent years. "In many areas of international policy we no longer regard Great Britain as a rival, but rather as a partner, whose interests and actions coincide with ours and supplement them," he stressed.

Uspenskiy noted, particularly, the identity of stands on Germany's reunification as regards its synchronisation with the all- European process. He said the main difference was on a united Germany's participation in military blocs. "This question calls for careful consideration and subsequent decisions," Uspenskiy said. He expressed conviction that the "British minister's visit would be an important phase in the search for such decisions."

Touching on other aspects of Anglo-Soviet interaction, Uspenskiy pinpointed their attitude to "future all-European structures." He greatly appreciated the recent "realistic proposals" advanced by Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in Cambridge. Noting the "high level of interaction" between the two countries in such areas as South Africa and Cambodia, Uspenskiy said "The Soviet Union wished to extend such partnership to the Middle East and Afghanistan."

At the same time, Uspenskiy noted that the favourable atmosphere of Anglo-Soviet relations "was still not rid of vestiges of the past and certain differences both on basic and peripheral matters." He said this primarily "referred to future East-West relations and the role of nuclear weapons."

Uspenskiy expressed the view that "Great Britain should at some future stage join the ongoing negotiations to reduce nuclear weapons or at least say when it would be ready to accede to this process. [no closing quotation marks as received]

Ryzhkov Receives Swiss Government Official

PM0804151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 p 5

[TASS Report: "Conversation in the Kremlin"]

[Text] Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov received Adolf Ogi, federal chancellor, head of the Swiss Federal Department of Transport, Communications and Energy, in the Kremlin today. Ogi is currently in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

When greeting the guest as the representative of the Federal Council, which is the Swiss Confederation's Supreme administrative and executive body, Ryzhkov voiced satisfaction with the markedly increased activity of the Soviet-Swiss political dialogue in recent years, promoting the development of relations between the Soviet Union and Switzerland in various fields and deepening their cooperation within the framework of the CSCE process.

Ogi spoke of support which the Soviet policy of perestroyka enjoys in Switzerland, pointing out that the country's population follow with great sympathies the changes taking place in the Soviet Union and efforts towards resolving problems of interethnic relations.

On behalf of the Federal Council, Ogi expressed readiness to promote further democratic reforms—including that through the development of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation.

Ryzhkov thanked A. Ogi and set out basic aspects characterizing the processes of social renewal of society and the formation of a law-governed state in the USSR. The institution of the office of executive president became one of the manifestations of the processes.

He also spoke of the development of events in Lithuania, pointing to a special importance of the forthcoming transformation of the Soviet federation on the strength of a union treaty.

Basing themselves on their own centuries-long experience in creating a democratic multi-ethnic state, people in Switzerland believe that the tactics and the way of action by the leadership of the Soviet Union in connection with the situation in Lithuania may produce positive results, Ogi said.

A wide range of matters concerning Soviet-Swiss relations were also discussed during the meeting. The two sides expressed a desire to further broaden and deepen the trade-and-economic contacts and cooperation in various fields—including the nuclear power industry, civil aviation and the training of economic personnel for the branches of the Soviet economy.

During the discussion of international problems, main attention was devoted to the pan-European process. It was pointed out that, in the light of the deepening economic integration in the region of the European communities, the building of the common European home, presupposes the establishment of close contacts between all countries of the continent and creates conditions for an active involvement of neutral and nonaligned countries in these processes.

Biryukova, Delegation Depart for Drug Conference

LD0704083590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0740 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—Aleksandra Biryukova, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, left for Great Britain today. She is leading the Soviet delegation to the international conference on cocaine and reducing the demand for drugs.

Arrives in London

LD0704140190 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] London April 7 TASS—A Soviet delegation led by Aleksandra Biryukova, deputy prime minister and alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo, arrived here today for an international drug conference.

Mogilev Hosts Netherlands-Soviet Joint Venture

PM0304120390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Interview with V. Semenov, general director of "East-West Corporation for the Development of Mogilev Oblast," by correspondent M. Mikhaylov; date and place of interview not specified; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "Corporation in Mogilev"]

[Text] A joint enterprise with the intriguing name "East-West Corporation for the Development of Mogilev Oblast" has begun its work in Mogilev. Our correspondent spoke to V. Semenov, this enterprise's general director, who is at the same time the general director of a silk fabric association:

[Mikhaylov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, what is the nature of the corporation?

[Semenov] I am not afraid to say that this is a unique phenomenon in our country. The corporation will tackle problems relating to the development of an oblast with a powerful multisectoiral industry. The most important thing is that we intend to use new, more integrated forms of East-West cooperation for the first time in our country throughout an entire region. This accords with the demands of perestroyka and the behest of the times in the full sense of the word.

How did the corporation arise? The Netherlands millionaire F. Lurvink offered us his services. He is a very active, well-known man in the West, who is successful at "reviving" enterprises or—more precisely—rapidly raising them to a high technological level. Let us develop your oblast together, he said to us, and, after weighing up all the "pros" and "cons," we agreed.

[Mikhaylov] How specifically is your Netherlands partner contributing to the concept of "developing Mogilev Oblast together"?

[Semenov] Lurvink has visited many enterprises in our oblast and has seen for himself their substantial industrial potential. He is at home on the world market. For instance, we can sell silk fabrics, man-made fibers, arts and crafts. But the trouble is that Soviet entrepreneurs do not have a very clear idea of their opportunities and are bad at finding their bearings amid the subtleties of the Western market. They need to be given more rapid assistance in this....

[Mikhaylov] Is that what the corporation will do?

[Semenov] Yes. Moreover, we intend to settle a very extensive range of problems together. I will only name the main ones. We intend to conduct an economic analysis of enterprises' economic activity, provide methodological and other assistance on questions of investment policy in the oblast and financing for promising projects, and hold consultations on questions of trade and economic cooperation and currency-finance transactions. We intend to elaborate recommendations to extend production and scientific-technical cooperation, provide services in setting up joint enterprises and information exchange, and take part in international exhibitions, etc. I think you will agree that we are extremely in need of skilled aid in solving these questions from experienced Western specialists.

[Mikhaylov] Who is involved in the corporation?

[Semenov] On the Soviet side, the "Khimvolokno" silk fabric production association and meat and dairy industry associations—all from our oblast, Mogilev Oblast. Plus the "Optim" consultancy center (Moscow). And on the Netherlands side—Lurvink and Company.

[Mikhaylov] But great amount of money is needed for such a major undertaking. Where are you going to get it from?

[Semenov] The Netherlands firm has invited American, West European, and Japanese banks to participate. The world-renowned bank Lazard Freres and Cie. (Paris) has agreed to be our corporation's general consultant. The joint enterprise's corporation capital totals $1 million. It was formed by the Soviet and Western sides on a parity basis. The profits will be distributed equally.

Latin America & Caribbean

Foreign Ministry Statement in Nicaragua Published

PM0704160190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed Report: "USSR Foreign Ministry Statement"]

[Text] Following is the statement of the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman released here today:

The Soviet Union received with satisfaction the announcement of the successful conclusion of a regular meeting in Nicaragua of the presidents of five Central American states, which adopted a number of important resolutions to intensify efforts to normalise the situation in the region.

We fully share the positive assessment contained in the final document of the results of the recent general elections in Nicaragua and of the role played by the country's present President Daniel Ortega in strengthening the process of democratization in this country.

At the same time we view with understanding the concern expressed by participants in the meeting over the lack of progress in the solution of the Contras issue and express support for the demand to demobilize and disarm groups of the Nicaraguan armed opposition before April 25.

We also view as absolutely fair the appeal formulated by the Central American leaders calling on the U.S. Administration to support the demobilization of the Nicaraguan resistance and transfer the funds earmarked for the opposition to the international commission for support and control so as to make possible the use of these funds to finance measures to facilitate the return of the Contras to peaceful life. This approach is all the more justified taking into account the fact that the emergence of armed opposition groups and their hostile activities against the legitimate Nicaraguan Government over the past almost ten years became possible thanks, above all, to the unstinted aid and comprehensive support from Washington throughout this period.

Of great importance is the agreement reached at the meeting to work out a schedule of talks on security, verification, arms control and reduction in the countries of the region. We welcome this initiative and reiterate our readiness to help with the preparation and implementation of possible agreements on this score.

On the whole it can be noted that another substantial step has been taken towards the reduction of armed confrontation in the region, towards the resumption and expansion of mutually beneficial cooperation in various fields, the deepening of integration processes and the ever broader involvement of Central American states in the life of the world community.

Burlyay Expresses Concern Over Contra 'Threat'

LD0604201790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1310 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—Today Yan Burlyay, deputy chief of the directorate for Latin American countries of the USSR Foreign Ministry, expressed the USSR's concern over "a threat of wrecking" the agreement on disarmament and the demobilization of the contras, which was attained on 23 March this year in Honduras between representatives of the future Nicaraguan Government and the leadership of the armed opposition.

Speaking at a briefing at the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry, the high ranking Soviet diplomat said that this is connected with the fact that members of the anti-Sandinista armed formations are leaving their bases in Honduras en masse and moving to Nicaraguan territory. Thereby, he stressed, they wish to avoid demobilization under the supervision of the international forces assigned by the United Nations for this purpose. The situation is being complicated by the fact that the contras undertake military actions in the process of their redeployment, as a result of which there are casualties among the civilian population and soldiers of the Sandinista People's Army.

"Such actions are threatening internal stability in that country and obstruct the policy of national reconciliation," said Yan Burlyay.

"One would like to hope," said the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman, "that the accords on the subject which have received unequivocal support from participants of the latest meeting of Central American presidents in Nicaragua, will be fulfilled in the long run and thereby one of the most important obstacles will be removed from an ultimate settlement in the region."

Sidorov Views Prospects in Nicaragua

PM0604141990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 90 First Edition p 3

[Captain S. Sidorov "Observer's Column": "When Will the Contras Lay Down Their Weapons?"]

[Text] The main result of the seventh meeting between the presidents of Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and El Salvador, which was held the other day, cannot fail to arouse satisfaction. For the umpteenth time the heads of the Central American states came to a unanimous opinion on the disbandment of the Contras. In accordance with the declaration adopted at the meeting the Contras should be disarmed and demobilized before 25 April—the date that Nicaraguan President-elect V. Barrios de Chamorro is sworn in.

And yet it is hard to avoid the feeling that even on this occasion the decision made by the presidential "five" might be no more than wishful thinking. Such decisions have been made on more than one occasion at previous summits, and the final timetable for Contra demobilization has been repeatedly altered. The main factor of opposition, which blocked the fulfillment of these decisions for many months, was Washington's desire to maintain "armed Nicaraguan resistance" as a tool for pressuring the Sandinistas with a view to "forcing" them to hold "honest and free elections." But now the elections, held under authoritative international monitoring and in full accordance with democratic norms, are behind us. Moreover, unexpectedly for many Washington politicians, the Sandinistas have been pushed into opposition by the U.S favorite—the political bloc headed by V. Barrios de Chamorro. The situation, at first glance, should suit Washington. This means that the Nicaraguans too have a real chance to finally bring the 10-year civil war to an end.

The chance is indeed real. To a considerable extent it is a result of the consistent policy implemented by the Sandinist National Liberation Front [FSLN]. But the FSLN is not the only political force in Nicaragua, although it continues to be highly influential. The implementation of new opportunities will depend on what result is achieved in the near future by forces operating both inside and outside the country.

The Sandinistas' position was reflected in the declaration by the meeting of Central American presidents. On the whole, it coincides with the position of V. Barrios de Chamorro, whose approach is conditioned by the compromise reached with the Sandinistas about control of the Army.

As for the Contras, emboldened after the elections, they do not want to disarm "straightaway." Essentially, the armed opposition would like their forces to be disbanded in parallel with radical cuts in the Sandinist People's Army—although, under the terms of the "Toncontin Agreement" concluded 23 March between them and representatives of the new government, the Contras should disarm first.

How might events develop in the weeks ahead? There seem to be two main "scenarios." The first proceeds on the basis of the consistent implementation of the decisions of the "Toncontin Agreement," which was supported by the Sandinistas. By protocol, the Sandinist

People's Army, as it is subordinate to the president's civil authority, would be cut in line with the country's economic potential and social requirements, and with the Central American accords. The Army would no longer be under party control. The priority disarmament of the Contras envisaged in this context would remove the FSLN's main concern and promote the further national reconciliation.

The other "scenario" would clearly be based on Washington's attempt to preserve the armed Contras formations. Their reduction could be encouraged on a "symmetrical" basis (alongside cuts in the Sandinist People's Army). But that route is a minefield. One need only imagine that some Sandinistas, discouraged by the election results, could feel they had been boxed into a corner. This could result in an extremely sharp reaction on their part to any Contras provocation. There could be an outburst of emotions (and quite a lot have been built up during the 10 years of the civil war) and a new wave of violence.

In the light of U.S. interference in the Central American region the latter option seems more likely to me personally. But now that important moves are being made toward political methods of settling the Central American conflict and there has been progress in the dialogue between the Salvadoran and Guatemalan insurgents and their governments, it is just the time for Washington to show political far-sightedness and eliminate the last obstacle in the way of peace and Central America in the shape of the Contras.

TV Marti Broadcasts to Cuba Condemned

LD0604163990 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The Soviet Union condemns the beginning of Tv-Marti broadcasts to Cuba and regards them as a violation of international law and interference in Cuba's internal affairs through subversive actions and the use of international radio frequencies in violation of the existing convention, deputy head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Directorate for Latin America Yan Burlyay told a briefing here today.

He described this practice as the one related to the times of the "cold" and "psychological" war, which was once experienced by the Soviet Union.

"Therefore," Burlyay emphasised, "it is quite obvious that the beginning of live broadcasts to Cuba by Tv-Marti, cynically named after Cuba's national hero Jose Marti, cannot but negatively affect the situation in Latin America and in the whole world."

"The Soviet Union sees the way out of the current situation in stopping Tv-Marti programmes and supporting Cuba's proposal to establish TV exchanges with the United States and expand contacts in radio and television broadcasting on a legal basis and on the principles of respect for the sovereign rights of each nation," Burlyay said.

Supreme Soviet Session

Secession Law To Be Enacted When Published

PM0604154590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Enactment of the USSR Law 'On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected With a Union Republic's Secession From the USSR'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To enact the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected With a Union Republic's Secession From the USSR" from the moment of its publication.

2. To establish that any actions connected with the formulation of the question of a union republic's secession from the USSR which run counter to the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected with a Union Republic's Secession From the USSR" and which are undertaken both before and after its enactment entail no legal consequences either for the USSR or for the union republics.

3. That the union republic Supreme Soviets are to bring union republic legislation into line with the USSR Law "On the Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected With a Union Republic's Secession From the USSR."
A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet
Moscow, the Kremlin, 3 April 1990

Supreme Soviet Agenda for 9 April

LD0804093890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] The next week of the USSR Supreme Soviet session will start tomorrow. A joint sitting of the chambers of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities will take place. The deputies intend to conclude the discussion of a draft law on the general principles of local self-government and local economy in the USSR and also to commence discussion of a draft law on the principles of state youth policy in the USSR.

Both Chambers To Meet

LD0904072790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0635 GMT 9 Apr 90

[TASS parliamentary correspondent report from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 9 April. (TASS)—After a break of 11 days, the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet have come together again today for a plenary session of both chambers, the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. On the agenda is an examination of the draft law on the foundations of youth policy in the USSR which has been prepared by the Komsomol Central Committee. This draft is being examined in its first reading.

In the time that has passed since the last plenary session, four major laws have been adopted at separate sittings of the chambers, recalled Anatoliy Lukyanov who is presiding. These are the laws on the basis for economic relations between the USSR and the union and autonomous republics; on the procedure for dealing with matters linked to the secession of a union republic from the USSR; on stepping up accountability for encroachments on citizens' equality of national rights and for violation of the territorial integrity of the USSR by force; and on the legal conditions of a state of emergency.

In accordance with a message from the USSR president to the USSR Supreme Soviet, parliament is to examine tomorrow the draft resolution on urgent measures to improve the situation of women and to protect mothers and children. Overall today and tomorrow, noted Anatoliy Lukyanov, the plenary sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet are to examine five draft laws.

Supreme Soviet Debates General Youth Policy

LD0904100590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Report by commentator Marina Novitskaya from the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin on 9 April—live]

[Text] The focus of attention today at the Supreme Soviet—and a joint sitting of the chambers has been under way since this morning—is the draft law on the general principles of a state youth policy in the USSR. I will say straight away that the need for such a law has not in itself led to any doubts among the deputies, and they have already examined it in the committees and commissions. I think many of them were distressed by the report made by Deputy Viktor Mironenko. He analyzed processes which, unfortunately, are typical today: a consumerist attitude in the past toward young people in the economy, when they were regarded merely as cheap labor, their lack of confidence in politics, and our impatience with their culture. As a result the alienation of young people from society is growing. Critical potential is building up amongst them, the first secretary of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee believes. The draft law is also, therefore, a means of winning young people over to perestroyka. Incidentally, the draft law is not the product of creativity on the part of Komsomol apparatchiks. Many scientists, young and old, worked on the draft and it was, naturally, debated at many organizations, both at the Komsomol and by the general public. International experience was used in its preparation. What emerged was that many of what are called the civilized countries have a long-term policy regarding young people—one that is, moreover, part of their overall social policy—and many questions as to whether such a law is needed or not would no doubt not have arisen had we had developed social legislation: for example on the position of women, the handicapped, and pensioners. It is not then a question in the law of some kind of extra rights or benefits for young people, but simply a question of creating conditions that would permit new generations to show their potential. A social state structure responsible for youth policies is, therefore, essential.

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Youth Affairs, Valeriy Ivanovich Tsybukh, also produced weighty arguments. He stressed that under conditions of radicalizing the economy and of narrowly interpreted financial autonomy, young people are turning into one of the least socially protected parts of society. After all, the heights of their achievements are as yet ahead of them, so that enterprises are free of them in the first instance. Tsybukh also stressed that the law is merely the pivot around which youth programs will be formed. The key word here is self-realization, the emphasis being on the word self.

A fairly heated debate developed. Hardly anyone now cast doubts on the need for a strong youth policy, but the lack of cohesion and striving for effect of the draft law were noted. For the moment the debates go on, and we will tell you about them in later bulletins.

U.S. Resolution on Lithuania Termed 'Interference'

LD0604150890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1210 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (TASS)—At a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet's International Affairs Committee, an exchange of views was held today on a U.S. Senate and House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee resolution on developments in Lithuania.

It was noted that the USSR Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR president issued a declaration on the unlawfulness of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet's decision on the republic's withdrawal from the union. As in any federal state, the Soviet Union's union legislation takes precedence over the legislation of a republic which is a part of the federation, and the U.S. legislators must be well aware of this.

The right of the Soviet socialist republics to self-determination, including secession and withdrawal from the USSR, is guaranteed under the Soviet Constitution and was confirmed by the third USSR Congress of People's Deputies. All matters connected with the withdrawal of union republics from the USSR must be considered in accordance with the law adopted this week by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Therefore, all the unlawful acts adopted at the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet session must be rescinded, and a discussion on all problems that arise begun on the only acceptable basis—within the framework of the USSR Constitution and the adopted laws.

As was stressed at the session of the committee, the ultimatum-like tone and attempts to tell the Soviet Union what it must do to resolve its internal problems, and how and when it must do it, are improper with regard to the sovereign rights of the Soviet people and its constitutional institutions of power.

The U.S. Senate and House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee adoption of resolutions on a union Soviet republic can only be seen by the International Affairs Committee as interference in the internal affairs of the Supreme state, which contradicts the standards and principles of international law.

Those who, in their own country, take as their starting-point the need to defend the constitution and legality, must respect the similar course of our actions.

The USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government have a greater interest than anyone else in resolving the situation that has developed in Lithuania by political means, through dialogue, in the context of perestroyka. This has been declared on more than one occasion, including at the highest level. But the attempt of U.S. legislators to influence the processes that are taking place, far from leading to a rapid settlement of the problem, actually helps to further aggravate the confrontation between the different popoulation groups in Lithuania. All this should have been borne in mind by the U.S. Congressmen.

The [House] Foreign Affairs Committee noted that the action taken by the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee did, unfortunately, depart from the recent trend toward expanding the deepening mutural understanding and cooperation between the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and between the United States and the USSR as a whole.

Supreme Soviet Defense Committee Meets

LD0604135390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy report from USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin]

[Text] Our listeners obviously already know that today is a working day for the Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. I have just come here to our correspondent's post from the session of one of the subcommittees—that is the subcommittee on the armed forces of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Issues. A very important question was examined at its session today. The concept of military reform was examined. It was proposed by a group of people's deputies who belonged to the commission set up by that subcommittee. The commission operated, well, it could be said, on a voluntary basis with the participation of leading specialists of a number of institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences and of military academies and military institutes.

Well, what is the essence of that military concept, the concept of military reform which the commission is proposing? Incidentally, people's deputy Major Lopatin delivered a report at the sitting of the subcommittee.

The essence could be formulated thus. It is the creation of legal regulations, of a state mechanism of the formation and implementation of military policy, the organization and use of our armed forces, the guarantee of the control of the military department by the highest state body and by society as a whole, with complete glasnost and the maximum possible openness, the democratization of the whole military organization of society in accordance with the principles of a law-governed state and the norms of international law. And, naturally, that reform should be carried out taking account of the national and historical traditions both of progressive Soviet and world experience of contemporary military organization. The reform itself envisages also as the professionalization by stages of the army, the orientation principally toward the qualitative characteristics of defense and military organization. On the whole, it is a rather large document which, of course, it is difficult to set forth fully in a short report. I think that in our interviews with people's deputies and in our commentaries we will turn to it on more than one occasion.

But on the whole, today, as a whole the subcommittee approved that concept. It has been proposed that the participants of the commission finish working on it in the next few days so that it can later be handed over for consideration in the committees and commissions of our Supreme Soviet in order that it already be widely discussed by all people's deputies.

I should say that our leading military leaders and workers of the Ministry of Defense practically did not take part in today's sitting. Somehow they have not shown interest in that work. Moreover, well, those participants in the commission, in the first place, of course, the military who have worked on the draft of the reform, and on its concept, have begun to experience certain troubles. I interviewed Aleksandr Valeriyaniyevich Tsalkov, lieutenant colonel and active participant of that commission.

[Begin recording] [Ruvinskiy] My question to you is this. At today's session it became known that some kind of pressure has been put on some staffers of the Ministry of Defense who are members of the commission. Well, obviously so that they would not take part in that commission. Well, how can that be assessed?

[Tsalkov] Well, as it should be assessed. Only there has been pressure. It was not put on in the process of the work, but it is being put on now that they have been acquainted with the final document of the commission.

[Ruvinskiy] When they signed it?

[Tsalkov] Yes, when they signed it and thereby affirmed that the views of some servicemen differ from the views of the leadership of the Ministry of Defense and, on the whole, our department is unused to that. All are supposed to think like the minister of defense, uniformly. And well, here differences have appeared in thinking, [word indistinct] in thinking.

[Ruvinskiy] Well, what do you think? Is the Ministry of Defense not interested in the elaboration of the concept of such a reform or does it simply want to develop its own concept so that there are no alternative versions?

[Tsalkov] You know, that is the classical rejection of everything that is new. We have already come upon that. That is, the concept has been developed further. We tried to bring it to the notice of the leadership of the Ministry of Defense on the eve of the second congress. A black mark was put beside it right at the onset, well, just as any idea, that that cannot be. Now, the second stage has already been gone through—that there is something in that. And at the highest political level of the country's leaderhip it has been said that deep military reform is needed. Well, and when we already began to go over from these positions thoroughly, well, and again, on the whole, our ideas are being rejected once again. [as heard] I think that the second stage will pass and there will be a third. That there is something in that, and then, that that has to be agreed with. And who doesn't know that? Well, on the whole [words indistinct].

[Ruvinskiy] Thank you. Well, the concept of our military reform is being born in a completely complex situation. I have to say that, as far as I know, the Ministry of Defense has posed the question in a rather drastic way. It is simply a question of the dismissal from the ranks of the armed forces of leading scientists, military scientists, who have taken part in the elaboration of that concept. [end recording]

Military Reform Examined

LD0604224290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1100 GMT on 6 April broadcasts a four-minute report by radio correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy on the session of the armed forces subcommittee that today examined the concept of military reform. Ruvinskiy says that there has been quite a lot of talk in Soviet society about reform in the military. An initiative group of voluntary workers has been drawing up the documents. This commission includes officers who are people's deputies, and military and civilian scientists; the chairman of the commission is People's Deputy Major Lopatin. The participants in today's session were adamant that reform is needed in the military, and quickly. Ruvinskiy says the concept of making the Army a professional one in stages is being considered. Another principle of military reform is to be the democratization of the Army in keeping with a law-based state. The introduction of national military formations is also proposed. Provision for this did exist in the legislation up until 1944, but was not used in practice. Ruvinskiy says that he has heard that the Ministry of Defense is drawing up its own conception of military reform. For the moment, a decision has been made that the document drawn up by the subcommittee should be submitted for discussion by the committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet.

Committee Rejects Socialist Enterprise Bill

LD0504215290 Moscow TASS in English 2144 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for Legislation, Legality, Law and Order considered it inexpedient to submit the bill on the socialist enterprise for the Soviet parliament's consideration.

The document should determine the framework of activities of various enterprises—state-run, cooperative, individual and mixed.

After considering this key economic bill the committee adopted a decision pointing to its multiple discrepancies with recently adopted laws, first of all with the Law on Property.

According to members of the committee, further elaboration of economic legislative acts should be aimed at the formation of the market-and-planned economy in the country and guarantee the real equality of various kinds of property.

Speaking at the meeting on Thursday, committee Chairman Yuriy Kalmykov pointed to the necessity to prepare new foundations of civilian legislation, ensuring the freedom of enterprise by the autumn session of the parliament.

Committee members also laid claims to the draft decree on the improvement of the position of women, protection of maternity and childhood, the necessity of which was not doubted. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's recent address to the parliament on the issue also testifies to this.

The main difficulty lies in the sources to finance the programme. According to Deputy Sergey Stankevich, the programme cannot be carried out without delegating additional powers to republican and local authorities. The committee will continue its work on the document.

New Subcommission on Northern Peoples Formed

LD0804035190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] One more defender of small northern peoples has appeared today in the country's parliament. The interests of the inhabitants of autonomous formations will be represented now by a new, second, subcommission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on the problems of small northern peoples.

Supreme Soviet Committee Work Reported

LD0604210790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1615 GMT on 6 April carries a 30-minute roundup of the proceedings of today's USSR Supreme Soviet session, which is meeting in committees and commissions.

Sergey Medvedev reports that a few days ago Gorbachev called for the adoption of a resolution to improve the situation of women and strengthen the family. He then quotes from that message to the Supreme Soviet. The Commission on Labor, Prices, and Social Policy began examining this issue today. It is essential to improve the living conditions of the most poorly-off families even before the state program in preparation is adopted. Child care benefits before the age of 18 months are to be increased, as are those for the children of servicemen's wives and women who are not at work. Orphans and those in care are also liable for greater benefits. Deputy Amanova is shown speaking on this topic, approving of such plans and asking that the draft law be kept simple to facilitate rapid adoption at the first reading, Medvedev reports.

The Subcommission on the Armed Forces of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Issues is concerned with the preparation and implementation of military reform in the USSR, something Medvedev imagines will be a relief to many in and out of the forces. Sociological surveys carried out by the Army have shown that interest in Army service has fallen. Politically, the Army tends to be conservative. Servicemen are disillusioned that change has thus far affected them little, Medvedev says.

Deputy Lopatin, who heads the commission, believes that a transition to a smaller professional Army is desirable. Military service is necessary in time of war, but only then and as needed. A professional Army is said to be favoured by 90 percent of Army officers. This means more pay and better housing, Lopatin says. Lopatin then elaborates on pay rates and possible improvements in work conditions, such as separate offices for warrant officers. Married quarters must improve, he concludes.

A professional Army, Medvedev notes, is likely to be more expensive. Medvedev then interviews two proponents of reform in the Armed Forces. People's Deputy Vladimir Petrovich Lukin says that today's work is an important step on that road. (Vitaliy Fedorovich Kovalevskiy), invited in as a military expert and himself in the Army, notes that military reform is needed for society first, then for the services themselves. The danger of the ideological basis of the Army being at variance with that of society must be avoided, he says. The Army has a long history of distortions and problems: Profound transformations are needed. More and more people want to leave the forces. A professional Army would be better in that it is selective: With conscripts, the Army has to take what it can get, he concludes. Lukin believes that the Constitution should contain an article on military service, since a professional Army means that the concept of military service as a sacred duty is no longer valid. The problem of the republics and national formations is touched upon. With increasing strife on ethnic grounds, these are not necessary, since it is the Army that must defend all-union structures, he says. (Kovalevskiy) believes that at least four to five years would be required to transfer to a professional Army.

Medvedev then notes that the Committee on Youth Affairs has been looking at employment issues. Young people, like women with children, the elderly, and the handicapped, are becoming an at-risk group in terms of finding employment. Sergey Kalashnikov is interviewed by Medvedev. He is the newly appointed head of a group to investigate the problems of employment. He wants the law on young people to include a specific section on employment. Analyses are required to see what is happening today. He cites the problem of military officers leaving the forces in connection with conversion to civilian production. He calls for greater investment in education. Enterprises working for profit will demand qualified workers. More training and retraining is needed. The professional and vocational schools, as they are today, no longer meet the requirements of the labor market. Kalashnikov believes that unemployment does exist and that its negative consequences must be minimized. It is no longer a case of offering people what work is available simply to earn a wage, but of helping them to fulfil their potential and apply their talent. Young people, Kalashinkov points out, should be able to influence politics.

Vladislav Flyarkovskiy then reports on amendments to the draft law on the press which is in its second reading. It was the subject today at the Committee for Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order and at that for Glasnost. There have already been many amendments and these have continued. He notes that the courts are to have greater authority in press affairs, e.g. in closing down a paper. The draft no longer enshrines the journalist's right to voice personal opinions in his or her writing or to have the final say in alterations or reductions of a specific piece. This and the right to objective and authentic information forms the basis for Flyarkovskiy's talk with N.V. Fedorov. Fedorov believes a fear of independent demands for information lies behind the decision to drop these rights, which were included in the first reading. At present there is no legal protection to combat a refusal to provide information which may be crucial to the country.

The Commission for Cultural Affairs has been discussing a range of cultural issues in light of a need for guideline principles on culture, intellectual property, museums, and monuments.

The Committee on Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing has been discussing a program of creative giftedness centering on how to bring up gifted individuals and keep them in the Soviet Union. (V.G. Razumovskiy) stresses the need to concentrate on people, not just economic factors. He is joined in the debate by V.S. Bolbasov, V.N. Belyayev, and V.A. Labunov. All these learned people believe that education should be given more attention at the Congress of People's Deputies, Flyarkovskiy concludes.

Political & Social

Text of Law on Republic Secession

PM0604150990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p 2

["USSR Law on Procedure for Resolving Questions Connected With a Union Republic's Secession From the USSR"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Article 1. The procedure for resolving questions connected with a union republic's secession from the USSR in accordance with Article 72 of the USSR Constitution is defined by the present law.

Article 2. The decision on a union republic's secession from the USSR is made by a free expression of the will of the union republic's people by means of a referendum (popular vote). The decision on holding a referendum is made by the union republic's Supreme Soviet on its own initiative or at the demand [of a petition] signed by one-tenth of the USSR citizens permanently resident on the republic's territory and possessing the right to vote under USSR legislation.

The referendum is held under the procedure defined by the USSR law or union or autonomous republic law on referenda, provided that their provisions do not run counter to the present law.

The referendum is held by secret ballot no sooner than six and no later than nine months after the adoption of the decision to raise the question of the republic's secession from the USSR.

USSR citizens permanently resident on the republic's territory at the moment when the question of its secession from the USSR is raised and possessing the right to vote according to USSR legislation take part in the referendum.

No campaigning whatever on the question submitted to the referendum is permitted during the holding of the vote.

Article 3. In a union republic which includes within its structure autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, or autonomous okrugs, the referendum is held separately for each autonomous formation. The peoples of autonomous republics and autonomous formations retain the right to independently decide the question of remaining within the USSR or within the seceding union republic, and also to raise the question of their own state-legal status.

In a union republic on whose territory there are places densely populated by ethnic groups constituting a majority of the population of the locality in question, the results of the voting in these localities are recorded separately when the results of the referendum are being determined.

Article 4. In order to organize a referendum on secession from the USSR, determine the date of the referendum, and sum up its results, the union republic Supreme Soviet forms a commission including representatives of all interested parties, including those mentioned in Parts 1 and 2 of Article 3 of the present law.

Article 5. In order to ensure full freedom in the expression of the will of the union republic's peoples in preparing, holding, and determining the results of the referendum on secession from the USSR, the USSR Supreme Soviet, in coordination with the union republic's Supreme Soviet, decides the question of the presence as observers on the republic's territory of plenipotentiary representatives of the USSR, union and autonomous republics, and autonomous formations. The USSR Supreme Soviet can, if it deems this to be necessary, invite UN representatives onto the republic's territory for the duration of the poll.

Article 6. The decision on the union republic's secession from the USSR is deemed to be adopted by means of the referendum if at least two-thirds of the USSR citizens permanently resident on the republic's territory at the moment when the question of its secession from the USSR is raised and possessing the right to vote according to USSR legislation vote in favor of it.

The results of the referendum are examined by the union republic's Supreme Soviet.

In a union republic including within its structure autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, autonomous okrugs, or places densely populated by the ethnic groups mentioned in Article 3 of the present law, the results of the referendum are examined by the union republic Supreme Soviet together with the autonomous republic Supreme Soviet and the relevant soviets of people's deputies.

Article 7. The union republic Supreme Soviet submits the results of the referendum to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet of a union republic possessing within its structure autonomous republics, autonomous formations, or places densely populated by the ethnic groups mentioned in Part 2 of Article 3 of the present law submits to the USSR Supreme Soviet the results of the referendum for each autonomous republic and for each autonomous formation or place densely populated by ethnic groups along with the conclusions and proposals of the relevant organs of state power.

If it is established that the referendum was carried out in accordance with the law, the USSR Supreme Soviet submits the question for examination by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

In the event of a violation of the law in holding the referendum the USSR Supreme Soviet schedules within a three-month period a repeat referendum for the republic, or for part of the republic, or for the autonomous formation, or for the place densely populated by the ethnic groups mentioned in Part 2 of Article 3 of the present law.

Article 8. Within one month the USSR Supreme Soviet sends the results of the referendum on the union republic's secession from the USSR and the proposals received from interested parties to the supreme organs of state power of all union and autonomous republics and also to the organs of state power of autonomous formations for study and evaluation of the consequences arising for each union and autonomous republic and autonomous formation from the fact of the possible secession of the union republic in question from the USSR.

Article 9. The Congress of USSR People's Deputies examines the results of the referendum in the union republic on the question of secession from the USSR, and also the opinions of the supreme organs of state power of union and autonomous republics and the organs of state power of autonomous oblasts and okrugs regarding this matter. At the submission of the USSR Supreme Soviet, coordinated with the Supreme Soviet of the seceding republic, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies lays down a transitional period not exceeding five years within which questions arising in connection with the republic's secession from the USSR must be resolved.

The USSR Constitution and USSR laws retain their force on the seceding republic's territory during the transitional period.

Article 10. In the event that a referendum does not result in the adoption of a decision on the union republic's secession from the USSR, a new referendum on the question may be held not less than 10 years after the holding of the previous referendum.

Article 11. With a view to safeguarding the rights and interests of the USSR, of the seceding union republic and other union republics, and also of autonomous republics, autonomous formations, and the ethnic groups mentioned in Part 2 of Article 3 of the present law in connection with the resolution of questions arising in the context of a republic's secession from the USSR, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviets of the union republics, and the supreme organ of state power of the seceding republic set up conciliation commissions for the transitional period.

Article 12. In the transitional period the USSR Council of Ministers, with the participation of the government of the seceding republic, prepares proposals on questions concerning the USSR state border and also military facilities and units of the USSR Armed Forces on the territory of the seceding republic and submits them for examination by the USSR president and the USSR

Supreme Soviet, after which they are passed on for examination by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Article 13. The seceding republic must observe the generally recognized principles and norms of international law, as well as human rights and freedoms enshrined in international treaties to which the USSR is a party. The question of the seceding republic's participation in multilateral treaties concluded by the USSR that are open for accession is resolved according to the rules stipulated by the relevant treaty. Multilateral and bilateral treaties concluded by the USSR and in force at the time of a union republic's secession from the USSR continue to apply to the seceding republic unless an agreement is reached to the contrary.

The USSR Council of Ministers, after examining and settling all questions connected with the USSR's participation in international treaties in the context of the secession of a union republic, submits its findings to the USSR president and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Article 14. In the transitional period the USSR Council of Ministers and the organs of state administration of union and autonomous republics and autonomous formations, in conjunction with the government of the seceding republic, examine and resolve questions of ownership and material and financial settlements.

In relations between the seceding republic on the one hand, and the USSR, as well as the other union republics, autonomous republics, autonomous formations, and the ethnic groups mentioned in Part 2 of Article 3 of the present law, on the other, in the transitional period the following questions must be resolved:

1) the fate of facilities under unionwide ownership (enterprises and complexes in base sectors of industry, space research, the power industry, communications, maritime, rail, and air transportation, communications lines, main pipelines, property of the USSR Armed Forces, and defense and other facilities) that are located on the republic's territory, as well as the property of unionwide social organizations, must be decided;

2) financial and credit settlements between the seceding republic and the USSR and relations between banks must be regulated;

3) the property and financial and credit relations of the republic in question with other union republics and also with autonomous republics and autonomous formations must be settled;

4) the procedure for the fulfillment by the seceding republic's enterprises and organizations of their preexisting contractual commitments with regard to enterprises and organizations located on the territory of other union republics as well as autonomous republics and autonomous formations must be defined;

5) the legal status and ways of settling accounts of joint enterprises or branches of enterprises organized on the basis of unionwide property or the property of other union republics, as well as autonomous republics and autonomous formations, must be defined;

6) a procedure for settling accounts with other state and international organizations with regard to credits and loans received for the construction of facilities on the seceding republic's territory or the satisfaction of the needs of that republic and its population, and also with regard to the relevant part of credits and loans spent on unionwide purchases and programs from which the seceding republic has benefited, must be agreed;

7) the status of territories not belonging to the seceding republic at the moment of its entry into the USSR must be agreed;

8) the status of the territories densely populated by the ethnic groups mentioned in Part 2 of Article 3 of the present law must be agreed, taking into account the results of their expression of their will in the referendum;

9) guarantees of the maintenance of historical and cultural monuments and burial sites on the territory of the seceding republic must be secured;

10) other questions requiring mutual settlement must be resolved.

Article 15. USSR citizens living on the seceding republic's territory are given the right to choose their citizenship and their place of residence and work. The seceding republic pays compensation for all costs incurred in connection with citizens' resettlement outside the republic.

Article 16. In conformity with universally recognized principles and norms of international law and international pledges given by the USSR, the seceding republic guarantees the civic, political, social, economic, cultural, and other rights of USSR citizens who remain resident on its territory without any discrimation whatsoever on the grounds of race, color, sex, language, religion, political and other beliefs, national and social origins, property status, and place or date of birth.

Article 17. Citizens of the seceding republic sentenced by its courts and serving their sentences on USSR territory are liable to extradition to serve the remainder of their sentences in the republic in question.

Citizens of the seceding republic sentenced by courts in the USSR or another union republic and serving their sentences on USSR territory are liable to extradition to serve the remainder of their sentence in the republic in question provided that the crimes for which they were sentenced were committed on that republic's territory.

Questions concerning the extradition of the seceding republic's citizens sentenced by courts in the USSR or another union republic if even one of the crimes for which they have been sentenced was committed outside the seceding republic's territory are examined by the

USSR Supreme Court at the submission of the USSR general prosecutor or on application by the seceding republic's Supreme Court.

USSR citizens, foreign citizens, and stateless persons sentenced by courts in the USSR or in any union republic and serving their sentences on the seceding republic's territory are liable to extradition to the USSR.

Article 18. All administrative and criminal cases instituted on the basis of offenses committed on the seceding republic's territory and being processed by USSR organs will be referred via the USSR Prosecutor's Office or the USSR Supreme Court for processing by the seceding republic's organs. This rule does not apply in cases where even one of the offenses was committed outside the seceding republic's territory, or in criminal cases triable by military tribunals. Questions concerning the transfer of cases are decided by the USSR general prosecutor at the submission of a subordinate prosecutor or by petition of the seceding republic's prosecutor, or, in the event that the case is being processed by a judicial organ, [are decided] by the USSR Supreme Court.

During the transitional period all civil cases are decided in conformity with USSR civil law and civil proceedings legislation, unless otherwise provided in the agreement between the seceding republic and the USSR.

Article 19. During the last year of the transitional period, on the initiative of the seceding republic's supreme organ of state power a repeat referendum may be held once on the question of confirming the decision on the union republic's secession from the USSR. The holding of a repeat referendum is mandatory if this is demanded by one-tenth of USSR citizens permanently resident on the republic's territory and entitled to vote under USSR legislation.

In the event that fewer than two-thirds of USSR citizens permanently resident on the republic's territory at the moment the question of holding a repeat referendum is raised and entitled to vote under USSR legislation vote in favor of confirming the decision on the union republic's secession from the USSR, the decision on the union republic's secession from the USSR is deemed to be repealed and the procedures envisaged by this law are terminated.

Article 20. At the end of the transitional period or earlier, if the questions envisaged by this law are settled ahead of schedule, the USSR Supreme Soviet convenes a Congress of USSR People's Deputies to adopt a decision confirming the completion of the process for coordinating the interests and satisfying the claims of the seceding republic, on the one hand, and of the USSR, union republics, or autonomous republics, autonomous formations, and ethnic groups mentioned in Part 2 of Article 3 of this law, on the other hand.

From the moment of the adoption of such a decision by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the union republic's secession from the USSR is deemed accomplished and USSR people's deputies from the republic which has seceded lose their powers.

The Congress of USSR People's Deputies makes relevant amendments to the USSR Constitution.
[Signed] M. Gorbachev, President of the USSR.
Moscow, The Kremlin, 3 April 1990.

Ligachev Calls for 'Cleansing' of CPSU Ranks

PM0704165590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 8 Apr 90 pp 1,2

[Interview with Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, by unnamed SELSKAYA ZHIZN journalists at close of conference-seminar in Moscow, for SELSKAYA ZHIZN own correspondents and central apparatus workers: "What Is Good for the Peasant Is Good for the Country"; date not specified]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [SELSKAYA ZHIZN] Political life in the countryside has become more active; this is illustrated by the newspaper's mailbag, where many trenchant and sometimes difficult questions are raised. In particular, we would like to ask Yegor Kuzmich how we are to understand the question of the demarcation within the party today—precisely today—and the cleansing of its ranks of those people who have taken up other ideological positions?

[Ligachev] There are forces operating in society which oppose socialism. Such forces are also present within the CPSU. The fact that we have allowed the party to weaken and grow loose [razrykhleninye] is the most dangerous thing. Those are our mistakes, the fundamental mistake made by the political leadership. Of course the burden of the past takes it toll on the party's prestige; the grave consequences of Stalinism, stagnant phenomena, and instances of some leaders' moral decay.

Communists have set the task of renewing the party. I believe that renewing the party does not only mean democratizing it and strengthening its ties with the masses, but also ensuring its real dissociation with those people within CPSU ranks who hold revisionist, nationalist, and social democratic positions. That is the task of cleansing the party. This must be done on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee's platform for the 28th party congress.

The point is that factions, groupings, and opposition forces are now at work within the party. On the basis of the "Democratic Platform" individual groups of communists want to transform the CPSU from within into a parliamentary party with factions. They rank themselves as radicals. Their position is not in fact new or radical. It is utter revisionism. The organizational foundations of the kind of party which they are proposing were laid last century when bourgeois democratic and social democratic parties were set up.

I would like to add that individual communists are not only involved in but also head nationalist separatist organizations. I believe that we must not delay in effecting this demarcation, otherwise there may be a split within the party. This has already happened in Lithuania and Estonia. It goes without saying that the work of cleansing [ochishcheniye] CPSU ranks must be conducted in a resolute and responsible fashion without any mistakes, in strict accordance with the CPSU Statutes and the USSR Constitution. To use Lenin's words, the cleansing of the party represents a "vast increase in its power and weight."

[SELSKAYA ZHIZN] Yegor Kuzmich, our readers are asking about events in East Europe. What is your opinion?

[Ligachev] Everything that has happened in Europe still needs in-depth analysis. I would like to say the following now. In politics it is important to view the development trend—from what and towards what. In some countries socialism is being lost, while NATO is reinforcing its position. An extremely strange conclusion is sometimes drawn from this fact. It is alleged that the changes occurring in the countries of East Europe have revealed new opportunities for overcoming European states' alienation. Really! By forfeiting socialist values? That's a dear price to pay!

I want peaceful coexistence to develop and cooperation between various states to become more active. But not if socialism is to be overthrown and capitalism reinforced. If things go any further, only the Soviet Union may join the "common European home" as a socialist state.

The creation of a united Germany via the absorption of the GDR will herald the end of postwar Europe, result in European stability being dangerously upset, and the results of World War II being completely erased. Under present conditions our task, as I understand it, is to help create an effective system of collective security in Europe, prevent another war, and support those forces which are engaged in the socialist renewal of their countries.

I believe that, historically speaking, this is just a temporary regression for socialism. I am convinced that communist ideas will prevail.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on 'View' Program

LD0604221390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1805 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "View" program, presented by Vladislav Listyev and Aleksandr Lyubimov; interview granted by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to Lyubimov and correspondent (Kraminov) while on board an aircraft in connection with Shevardnadze's visit to Namibia; date not specified—recorded]

[Text] [Lyubimov] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, you have spoken out boldly in the press from a very progressive standpoint. You are beginning to shine forth, so to speak, as one of the more, let's say, serious supporters of Gorbachev and active developers of his ideas, as it were. Are you not afraid that if something goes wrong your colleagues will make short work of you, those who perhaps take a more skeptical view?

[Shevardnadze] Well, you know...first of all, thank you for the compliments. [chuckles]

[Lyubimov] Well, they are compliments today, but perhaps after a while they will no longer be.

[Shevardnadze] Perhaps. Each of us expresses his opinion, and this, I think, is the main accomplishment of perestroyka. We are not afraid to express our opinions, including ones that don't always correspond to the view or even the principles of our colleagues. We have some heated arguments, sometimes in public, too. But this is natural for any democratic state which is what we are aspiring toward.

[Lyubimov] Of course.

[Shevardnadze] As for making short work of me....

[Lyubimov interrupts] Well, perhaps not physically, but, you see, our country has undemocratic traditions. After all, it's possible that some of the Politburo members might reach an agreement with the Army, say, while our KGB is conservative enough not to interfere at all, and a political coup could occur. Everyone's very much afraid of this, and perhaps it's the awareness of this fact that is holding most people back from taking some step themselves to improve their private lives or the affairs, let's say, of their labor collective, and so on. People are afraid; afraid, first and foremost, because they do not know whether Gorbachev is strong enough or not.

[Shevardnadze] I understand well what you are saying, that this is not a question of my personality....[pauses] Incidentally, I said in the Supreme Soviet that if I should make any decision that was not accepted by people I would be ready to resign on the spot. Those were not just words; that is what I will do.

As for your second question about a possible coup or change, so to speak, in the policy our country is now pursuing, this is a serious issue. Very serious, and I understand you well, and your concern. I myself am very much concerned. The military or the KGB are neither here nor there....

[Lyubimov interrupts] No, but this, of course....

[Shevardnadze interrupts] That's not the point.

[Lyubimov] A political coup....

[Shevardnadze interrupts] If perestroyka doesn't work out—I said this at the plenum and it was published—if perestroyka doesn't work out, if we don't manage to bring the democratic processes to a conclusion, there will definitely be a dictator, a dictatorship. I can't envisage anything else. So we must cherish these processes, they have to be cherished, intensified and expanded. Support must be given to everyone, and in the first place to Comrade Gorbachev who has led this struggle, who began, so to speak, this process, this revolutionary process. I know well how difficult it was at the beginning; it was a difficult decision. This is a serious, a very serious issue, but we need bold people, we need solid support for everything that is now progressive in our affairs.

[(Kraminov)] Eduard Amvrosyevich, you have held this office for almost five years. Has there ever been a point at which you were ready to resign?

[Shevardnadze] [long pause] There was one moment. When the Congress of People's Deputies was discussing the question of events in Tbilisi. I have spoken of this. I was ready then, after having listened to the speech of the prosecutor, the procurator...[pauses] I really got to the stage...[pauses] of losing my equilibrium. Why? because when I went to Tbilisi I promised the people that I would do all I could to establish the truth, the truth. And when people speak falsehoods, that is the worst thing. That is intolerable. Particularly in our times. Therefore, I was terribly and deeply upset then. I want to say this quite frankly: Were it not for Mikhail Sergeyevich, I would not have remained.

[Lyubimov, over loud music] We will acquaint you with the minister's travel crew, which guarantees that the member of the Presidential Council and of the Politburo can maintain permanent contact with Moscow, which looks after the itinerary of each visit, guards, feeds, transports, and interprets for the minister, and which never allows breakdowns to occur. Watch the movie "The Team" this time next week. "The Team," a "View" presentation. [video shows Shevardnadze being interviewed; members of his team; Shevardnadze inside an aircraft, disembarking; having tea with Gandhi]

Shevardnadze Returns From U.S. Visit

LD0704122290 Moscow TASS in English 1117 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze returned to Moscow today after completing his working visit to the United States.

Procuracy Seeks Gdlyan-Ivanov Indictment

LD0704230690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1825 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Announcement by the USSR Procuracy—From the "Topical Interview" program]

[Text] Lately, investigators Gdlyan and Ivanov, aware of their imminent answerability for the unlawful acts they committed, their slander and insults in relation to many citizens, have started stepping up all sorts of insinuations against the law enforcement bodies, the country's political leadership, and the commission set up by the Congress of People's Deputies in connection with a case of bribe-taking in Uzbekistan. This was evidenced, in particular, by Deputy Ivanov's recent appearance on Leningrad television.

The USSR Procuracy states that another provocative ballyhoo raised by Gdlyan, Ivanov, and their revelations has little in common with the facts or with a search for the truth. Another provocative farce is being played by Gdlyan and Ivanov counting on the fact that some citizens are ignorant in legal matters. They manipulate investigation materials and circullate individual records of interrogations deliberately taken separately from other documentary evidence and containing deliberately false information which was refuted long ago by the investigation and the court.

In connection with serious breaches of legality committed during the investigation headed by Gdlyan and Ivanov, which have had grave consequences, the USSR procurator general has made a representation to the USSR Supreme Soviet asking it to consent to dismissing them as USSR People's Deputies, and from the procurcy bodies, and to consent to bringing a criminal prosecution against them.

Medvedev Views Issue

LD0804010590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1827 GMT on 7 April, following an unscheduled announcer-read USSR procuracy statement announcing that criminal charges will be brought against Gdlyan and Ivanov, carries a 16-minute interview with Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, USSR people's deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet by Igor Aleksandrovich Kudrin, Central Television political observer.

Medvedev, co-chairman of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies commission investigating the work of the Gdlyan investigation group, says the commission has completed its work, and next Wednesday or Thursday should meet to discuss a report to be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which will also be published. A joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities will be held, at which the Gdlyan commission report and the reports of the commissions for ethics and for criminality and law and order will be heard. "Furthermore, the USSR Procuracy has completed the preliminary investigation on issues relating to violation of legality in Uzbekistan. The USSR Procuracy has submitted to the Supreme Soviet a proposal and request for criminal charges to be brought against Gdlyan and Ivanov, and for them to be discharged from their work. It is the Supreme Soviet who must decide this, because they are people's deputies. This whole sitting is to take up an entire working day of the Supreme Soviet, and viewers all over the Soviet Union will be able to watch this program, will be able to watch the whole discussion between Supreme Soviet deputies, between the defenders and opponents of Gdlyan and Ivanov, or the defenders and opponents of the USSR Procuracy. I think this broadcast will be very important and very interesting; one cannot predict the results of it, because this decision is the prerogative of the Supreme Soviet. It is our task to report our conclusions: I cannot say today what the Supreme Soviet will decide," Medvedev notes.

Prompted by Kudrin, Medvedev recalls how his commission was set up, at the First Congress of People's Deputies, primarily at the request of Gdlyan's electorate; initially, Gdlyan and Ivanov worked with the commission, but ceased cooperating with it, Medvedev says, "when they saw the commission's work was going in a different direction from what they wanted." Medvedev cites a general list of people whose evidence has been heard by the commission, including Pugo, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. "I should say that our conclusions substantially diverge from those of the USSR Procuracy. Our commission diverges from the USSR Procuracy in the sense that the USSR Procuracy lays stress first and foremost upon the work of Gdlyan and Ivanov and his investigatory group; whereas we consider that it was necessary first of all to study the work of the procuracy itself. For Gdlyan and Ivanov are not individual heroes who carried out work fighting the mafia in Uzbekistan. They are heads of an investigatory group appointed by the USSR Procuracy, selected by the USSR Procuracy." Medvedev remarks, continuing that "a multitude of circumstances enable us to come to the conclusion that the chief responsibility for the disgraceful things that occurred during the investigation of affairs in Uzbekistan—and there were indeed a lot of disgraceful things and violations of legality—nevertheless lies with the USSR Procuracy, because it failed to organize proper supervision. The first person—not even an accused, but a witness—committed suicide, threw himself out of a window." He notes that this happened amid suspicious indications that he was beaten. Nevertheless, Gdlyan and Ivanov were allowed to continue their work. Subsequently 10 suicides of witnesses and those under investigation were registered; there were deaths in prison, possibly connected with beatings, of people under investigation or imprisoned, Medvedev continues, "Yet the Procuracy failed to carry out the appropriate checks. The Procuracy wanted to make the work of Gdlyan and Ivanov into an advertisement for itself; There were shows in the Procuracy building of huge quantities of valuables which had allegedly been confiscated by the Gdlyan-Ivanov group in Uzbekistan, while the investigation procedures normal for such actions had been infringed." No proper account was kept of the valuables and monies.

Asked how it was possible for professionals to commit such crude errors, Medvedev says the blame lies with the entire procuracy: "The entire procuracy, its whole practice of work, should be attentively discussed at the Supreme Soviet."

Kudrin points out that Gdlyan and Ivanov enjoy great popularity among the public. Medvedev says this is no secret. "In the first place, for nearly two years the press tried to make them into idols, heroes, and the Procuracy wanted to use them for self-advertisement. Given that the Procuracy is not a very respected law enforcement body in our country, it wanted to boost its reputation a bit. The second, probably more important reason, is that the Brezhnev regime was wallowing in corruption and bribetaking, not only in Uzbekistan but also in other areas of the country. Yet the Procuracy did not bring charges against Medunov, nor did it investigate accusations brought against Grishin at various times. There is a great deal of material in our press about violations of legality by Aliyev. Leningraders, for instance, are sure that there were abuses of power under Romanov; Muscovites are sure there were abuses of power under Grishin. In Kazakhstan there are quite a lot of people who are sure that Kunayev was to a considerable degree involved in corrupt affairs. Yet no investigations were begun against any of these people. Some of them were expelled from the party, but many of them have until recently been personal pensioners of all-union rank and enjoyed privileges, because demands for them to be called to account, demands even for investigation of their activities, were rejected. This gave rise to dissatisfaction among the people. This created the soil, the atmosphere, in which the people saw Gdlyan and Ivanov as heroes, idols.

"That is why it is today very difficult to bring all this back down to earth, so to speak, to show that these are ordinary investigators, typical investigators of the 1970s, people who were shaped in the 1970s, the years of lawlessness, the years when everything was permitted. They moved into the 1980s just like that. They were not so very different from hundreds and hundreds of other investigators of that time, who also got up to things which were not so very good, though perhaps in a less concentrated form, and with lesser violations of legality. Even today we often meet cases of investigators condemning innocent people, whilst freeing the guilty ones, leaving them unpunished."

Kudrin interrupts Medvedev's line of thought to ask, "Incidentally, Roy Aleksandrovich, all Moscow and Leningrad are talking about yesterday's Leningrad Television program, where the chief character was investigator Ivanov. How do you explain such an unexpected appearance on the screen?" Medvedev replies, "Well, it is hard for me to say, since this took place in Leningrad. Of course, I can understand that Ivanov wants to anticipate the Supreme Soviet sitting: there are forms of pressure, pressure upon the Supreme Soviet, pressure upon our commission. I should point out that over the last few months, perhaps the last six months, our commission has been subjected to a huge amount of pressure, first and foremost from many committees for the defense of Gdlyan and Ivanov. The last meeting to which our cochairme Strukov and Yarin were invited ended in a scandal: They were not allowed to speak, even though they had been invited, and they had to leave the hall under militia protection. This pressure was thus continued yesterday through the Leningrad Television channel. This was an attempt to anticipate the decision the Supreme Soviet is to make, but this is an attempt using worthless means, for the Supreme Soviet has demonstrated the independence of its verdicts, and a program like that is hardly likely to influence the decision of the Supreme Soviet. The Supreme Soviet, I think, will pronounce a just decision."

Medvedev explains Gdlyan and Ivanov had free access to commission sessions. To start with, the commission sat in closed session, but since Gdlyan and Ivanov kept addressing public meetings, the commission held its sessions as open parliamentary hearings from the autumn of 1989; the television and press were also able to attend. Gdlyan and Ivanov attended six sessions, and were able to examine witnesses, "though I would not say that they behaved themselves sufficiently properly," Medvedev notes. Representatives of the two were also on the commission, and kept them informed of proceedings, which were fully public from September of last year.

Asked his personal opinion of the whole affair and the protagonists, Medvedev says he regards it as a survival of former times; The work of the Gdlyan investigation group demonstrated all the shortcomings of Stalinist and Brezhnevite times, "the time when there was no law-governed state in the USSR, when corruption of party and state organs held sway, and when the law enforcement organs had no real protective function, when they were subject to rule by telephone" and failed to fulfill their duties. "This all bears witness to the shortcomings of our entire system of law enforcement bodies, which unfortunately remain in large degree even today, and to the vices of former epochs, which were indeed to a considerable degree epochs of corruption, licence, and crime," he says. This makes it difficult to apportion the real blame, and everything possible must be done to ensure such epochs are not repeated.

CPSU Decision on Need To 'Restructure' PRAVDA

LD0604123890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a decision on the PRAVDA newspaper. The document notes that the standard of material contained in that publication until recently did not correspond fully to the present requirements and needs of readers. Since the renunciation of the constitutionally enshrined leading position of the CPSU, the task of strengthening the party's consolidating role and intensifying its ideological and political influence on the masses has also arisen in a new way; and a highly important place in this belongs, of course, to the party press. In order to fulfill its purpose, the PRAVDA newspaper must now restructure itself actively, resolutely rejecting dogmatism, stereotypes, and conventionalism on its pages.

The decision will be published in full tomorrow.

Text of Resolution

PM0604194590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "CPSU Central Committee Resolution On the Newspaper PRAVDA"]

[Text] The resolution points out that the contemporary phase in perestroyka and the process of radical transformations of all spheres in the life of society are setting the CPSU with the unprecedentedly large-scale and complex tasks of resolutely renewing the party and the style and methods of its activity. This is particularly important given the party's renunciation of the CPSU's constitutionally-guaranteed leadership status. For this reason, the task of strengthening the party's vanguard, consolidating role and reinforcing its ideological and political influence on the masses is taking a new form. The party press, above all the CPSU Central Committee organ, PRAVDA, has a highly important role in this constructive work.

The CPSU Central Committee points out that, until recently, the standard of PRAVDA's articles did not fully agree with the readers' contemporary demands and requirements. In order to fulfill its purpose, the newspaper PRAVDA, like all our party press, must actively restructure itself, resolutely rejecting elements of dogmatic thinking, stereotypes, and conventionalism, and flesh out with real and vital content Lenin's principles of a new-type press—the press of and for the people, free, truthful, honest, and frank, a press that enjoys the readers' confidence, and uses language comprehensible to all its readers.

Readers expect our press to speak the truth, give an in-depth and competent analysis of the practical work of perestroyka, and clear and precise assessments of both the positive changes that have been made and the reasons for the socioeconomic difficulties, breakdowns, and adverse phenomena which provoke social tension in society.

Hence the growing exactingness on the work of the press. Lenin's instructions to the party press sound particularly topical again today: Less political blather, more practical actions, and more effort to instruct the masses using specific examples from life. Our press must play an active, creative, constructive role in uniting and rallying all healthy forces in society on the platform of perestroyka.

It is the party duty of communist journalists and everyone employed by the country's party publications to write the truth and nothing but the truth, and insistently and consistently implement the CPSU line—the course of radical perestroyka and renewal.

As the party's main forum in the press, it is PRAVDA's task to focus its attention on key areas in the implementation of CPSU policy.

In-depth, comprehensive coverage of the processes of perestroyka, and the reform of the party in the spirit of the ideas of the CPSU Central Committee February and March (1990) plenums should be a leading topic for PRAVDA and all party journalism at the present stage in perestroyka. One should proceed from the premise that the renewed party is conceived as the party of socialist choice, which, by creatively developing the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, expresses the interests of the working class and all working people. It does not assume state powers of command. Its role is to be the democratically acknowledged leader, which wins the people's trust by its policy and all its practical work, operating via communists in soviets of people's deputies, other bodies, and public entities.

In ridding itself of functions alien to it, the CPSU is concentrating its efforts on elaborating theory and action programs, on organizational and educational work, the consolidation of society, and the implementation of cadre policy. The party will be able to successfully fulfill its task in the new conditions by the implementation of an in-depth democratization, which must be founded on the power of the party masses.

During the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress, PRAVDA and the entire party press must vigorously promote a wide-ranging and in-depth analysis of the path covered by the Soviet people and the party, and the resolution of new tasks facing its organizations. The developing party-wide debate and the discussion of the pre-congress draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the new party statutes must be geared toward this.

It is necessary to develop constructive dialogue within the party press, conduct it from principled party positions, involving in it a broad range of participants representing the whole spectrum of social forces that uphold the renewal of socialism, and vehemently and earnestly oppose any attempts to refute our socialist choice. It is necessary to reveal the underlying link between the Soviet people's devotion to the socialist idea and their patriotic aspiration to render their fatherland a country of true prosperity and justice. When giving coverage to the historical continuity of generations, it is necessary to focus on the 45th anniversary of the great victory and the Soviet people's tremendous services to mankind in liberating the world from the fascist plague.

There must be more extensive surveys of letters from communists and nonparty people. While carefully taking all opinions into consideration and without "glossing over" authors' ideas, the newspaper must at the same time assert a party perestroyka stance, submit problems that arise for discussion in a timely manner, seek answers to topical questions, and deal a well-reasoned rebuff to "right-wing" and "left-wing" demagogues and to everyone who tries to discredit the party and Lenin's principles of socialism. It is necessary to keep up PRAVDA's initiative in publishing "Discussion Leaflets" which help to develop pluralism of opinion and reveal the diverse interests and viewpoints of all strata of the population.

It is necessary to ensure that members of the CPSU Central Committee political leadership and CPSU Central Committee members give prompt and systematic explanations in PRAVDA on the most acute questions relating to the renewal of the party and the life of society.

PRAVDA's attention must focus on such important political events as reports and elections within party organizations and their everyday activity, along with the work of soviets of people's deputies of all levels, state bodies, and public organizations.

Disparate, contradictory processes in the ideological and political sphere require in-depth investigation by journalists and objective coverage in PRAVDA. Multilayered, multifaceted social life must be analyzed carefully and competently along with the various stances of social movements and groups, a constructive dialogue must be conducted with them, and the party's intellectual and perestroyka potential enhanced to the utmost degree. Recalling and developing the lessons of truthful reporting, it is important to clearly distinguish in our past between that which is the result of authoritarian bureaucratic deformations and the consequence of the violation of socialist principles, and that which represents the party's and the people's real contribution to their own country's progress and that of all mankind. It is necessary to resist attempts to erase everything of true value in our historical heritage and question our moral and spiritual guidelines, along with our devotion to socialist choice and the communist perspective.

It is the duty of PRAVDA and the entire party press to provide a contemporary analysis of Lenin's legacy and combine it in a living, vital way with our experience of restructuring society and with the ideals of perestroyka. Keeping faith with Lenin's teaching means developing his philosophy and methodology, enriching it with new conclusions and theses, renouncing once and for all the canonization of individual formulae which were dictated by the specific situation and which are altogether part of their time, and defending Lenin's legacy and V.I. Lenin's persona from any attempts to distort or discredit them.

PRAVDA must be the prestigious platform for the rapidly developing social thought which aims to elaborate a contemporary concept of humane, democratic socialism, and for generalizing the experience of the social renewal of society; it must graphically and intelligibly propagandize everything that is new and progressive, both in theory and in practice, born of the creativity of the masses and the development of social sciences.

PRAVDA and the entire party press should focus their attention on people. One of the most important tasks facing the editorial office and its journalists is the implementation of the party's active social policy, which is oriented towards people, their concerns, and needs. A socially-just society must live by humane ideals and regard it as being of paramount importance to comprehensively develop the individual and his diverse spiritual and material interests.

One must consider the fact that amid the broadening of democracy and glasnost, the country's citizens have obtained new opportunities to manifest their interests and make demands, and working people's influence and control over the course of perestroyka is increasing. However, one must not forget that socioeconomic demands can only be met through better organization, a steady increase in labor productivity, and a new attitude towards work.

PRAVDA and all our press must be more trenchant in raising the question of whether words and actions correspond at all levels and render fulfillment of the adopted decisions subject to verification by glasnost.

The package of measures to speed up scientific and technical progress, which must ensure our advance and attainment of new levels of labor productivity and output quality, deserve particular attention. It is necessary to do everything to promote the development of basic scientific research, state-of-the-art technologies, the complex of human sciences, and cover the achievements in the conquest of space and in the resolution of mankind's global problems.

Organizational and political work must be geared to enhance the effectiveness of labor collectives' activity, speed up radical economic reform, and improve the economic situation in the country. The consistent solution of questions linked with the improvement of the economic mechanism and management, the structural transformation of the economy, the ubiquitous introduction of economic accountability [khozraschet], the increasing of the quality of output and work in general, the struggle to make full use of reserves, and the strengthening of labor, production, and contract discipline must be the main areas in the activity of PRAVDA and the other mass media.

There must be prompt yet thorough coverage of new forms of production organization born of economic questing, and the development of economic thinking must be promoted. An important task is to transform state ownership into ownership democratically controlled by the working people themselves on the basis of the lease, full economic accountability, the contract, joint-stock, and other contemporary forms of management with consideration for the scale of production, the specific nature of the regions, and the level of development of integration ties. The party does not consider that the existence of individual labor ownership, including ownership of the means of production, is a variance with the contemporary stage of the country's economic development.

It is the duty of the press to actively back up every searching individual, every innovative collective, and not only extensively propagandize the frontrunners' experience, but also endeavor to ensure its most speedy introduction and do their utmost to help resolve urgent problems in the life of the working person.

Our state's future depends to a tremendous extent on how interethnic relations develop. This requires the PRAVDA editorial office and all the mass media to manifest a profound, responsible approach to the coverage of complex problems relating to the development of our country's peoples and ethnic groups, their multifaceted life, and the vigorous struggle to combat all forms of nationalism and chauvinism. The key principles in party policy are unconditional observance of the rights of a citizen of any nationality throughout the country's territory, the real fleshing out of the sovereignty of the union republics, a new level of independence [samostoyatelnost] for all types of national autonomous formations, the preservation of the country's integrity as a federation of free and equal republics which voluntarily delegate some of their rights to the union in order to achieve common aims.

PRAVDA and the party press must increase their contribution to the development and cleansing of all spheres in the spiritual life of society, and reveal and augment the people's political, intellectual, and cultural potential. Logic itself and the essence of perestroyka require a vast increase in philosophical, political, and production culture, the culture of human relations, and environmental, artistic, and legal culture as an invariable condition for the creation of a socialist rule-of-law state.

All the potential of culture must be geared to improving the moral climate in the country and asserting the principles of general human moral norms. A great deal here also depends on attention to the family, school, and the upbringing of children and all young people. These vitally important problems must be given most extensive coverage in PRAVDA.

It is the task of the CPSU Central Committee's organ to provide extensive coverage of the party's foreign political activity. Its policy founded on the new thinking has already produced positive results: The world is freeing itself from the shackles of confrontation, important steps have been taken in disarmament, and towards the phased elimination of nuclear weapons. The danger of a world military conflict has lessened. All this also helps to resolve domestic socioeconomic tasks. At the same time, a long difficult path still has to be covered before the ideal of a peaceful future for mankind is realized. It is the task of PRAVDA and the party press to actively help to implement these noble goals, and at the same time combat the forces of reaction, militarism, and imperialism.

The resolution notes the need to strengthen in every way the links between the party committees and PRAVDA and the party press as a whole. The PRAVDA editorial office and all party committees must be more active in working to ensure the effectiveness of what they publish. It can be said without greatly stretching the point that party committees' and officials' attitude to PRAVDA's principled articles is in many respects a general indication of how perestroyka itself is faring at local and central levels. Underestimation of glasnost and curbs on criticism will inevitably lead to inertia and stagnation. In those areas where party committees manifest principledness, objectivity, and attention to people's needs and requirements, critical press materials are regarded as a help, an active means of overcoming mistakes and eliminating shortcomings. On the other hand, slogans about the development of glasnost will remain empty phrases if trenchant articles in the mass media are not backed up by concrete measures against those people who are trying to guard themselves against fair comment, who have come to believe in their infallibility, and who attack people who dare to "wash dirty linen in public."

Party committee workers must feel that they are comrades and colleagues in their relations with party journalists, and help the press guarantee the effectiveness of their items, broaden the authors' aktiv, and firmly establish an esprit de corps. Close cooperation between party committees and the press in settling life's problems is a necessary condition for the implementation of the humane aims of perestroyka and the building of a rule-of-law state.

The implementation of these critical tasks, especially in conditions of political pluralism, demands from PRAVDA journalists and our entire party press a high level of competence, profound insight into life, keen thought, and professional skill. The processes under way in society are moving apace, stimulated by a clash of passions and interests; they have to be reported objectively, in a well-balanced manner, with expert knowledge, and at the same time committedly, with passion, or what is described as soul. It is necessary to eradicate cliquishness, opportunistic bias, and vanity from journalistic practice, flaws which produce a negative reaction to news media publications and evoke people's justified indignation.

Service to the socialist fatherland and the people has always distinguished the best representatives of the intelligentsia. Editors are personally responsible for the content of their publications and the authenticity of the printed word. No matter where a communist journalist is working, he must be an active, modern, and thinking fighter of the party.

The activity of the PRAVDA editorial office party organization, the resolution says, must be geared to the galvanization of the creative efforts of staffers, the enhancement of their journalistic skills, the widening of their political horizon, and the creation of an atmosphere of mutual exactingness, party comradeship, and enhancement of the responsibility of every communist for the fate of the perestroyka.

Questions of the development of the network of correspondents, the operation of correspondent's bureaus, the organization and rallying around them of a large aktiv of contributors, psychological and professional features of the work of their own correspondents and their place in the editorial apparatus and in the life of the region where they are working and in local political, social, and public institutions and organizations must be constantly in the field of vision of the PRAVDA editorial collegium and the editorial office collective.

Local party organs are obliged to provide all-around assistance to the newspaper correspondents to enable them to discharge their functions fruitfully and efficiently.

The PRAVDA editorial collegium has been instructed to elaborate new principles of dealing with working people's letters. In this it is necessary to proceed from the premise that the editorial office is a creative organization rather than a state or departmental institution. And the aim of the work with letters is to study public opinion in key areas of party and state policy. The editorial office has been instructed to set up, jointly with the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences and the USSR Academy of Sciences and on their basis, special groups for the study of public opinion, and to carry out up-to-date polls among readers on topical articles published by the newspaper.

Concern for increasing the prestige and popularity of the party's central organ is a long-standing party tradition. We must ensure that PRAVDA becomes the true focus of the country's intellectual and creative forces, and that contributions to the newspaper are regarded as a matter of honor. The editorial collegium must do everything in its power to attract the best journalistic forces to become PRAVDA collaborators. It is necessary to view favorably the establishment of "Friends of PRAVDA" clubs in the country. It is necessary to organize annual PRAVDA festivals turning them into major political events.

Work with the local party press must be regarded as a key task of the editorial office. It is necessary to regularly publish press, radio, and television reviews in the newspaper and organize temporary attachments to PRAVDA of local journalists and trips by experienced PRAVDA journalists to visit colleagues at local level.

The newspaper's editorial collegium is authorized to decide questions pertaining to the form of publication of official materials, determine the structure and staffing of the editorial office, open and close correspondent's bureaus at home and abroad within the confines of the staff allocated for this purpose, and conclude labor contracts with editorial office staffers.

The PRAVDA editorial office and the CPSU Central Committee Administration of Affairs are instructed to draw up proposals to reinforce the material and technical base and step up the social development of the editorial collective of the newspaper and the publishing house and to submit them for the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat's consideration.

Draft Statute on Party Control, Auditing Body

LD0604205190 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 6 Apr 90

[By TASS commentator Boris Prokhorov]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—A draft statute of the Central Control and Auditing Commission of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) was circulated here on Friday. It was endorsed by the plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee in March this year.

Like the previously published draft rules of the CPSU, it is being brought up for discussion by the communists in the run-up to the party's 28th congress, which is to be convened this summer and endorse these major party documents.

The draft statute outlines the sphere of rights and duties of the CPSU's new central body. The commission combines the functions of the now existing Central Auditing Commission and the Party Control committee under the CPSU Central Committee. These two bodies, judging by everything, will be abolished. It is also suggested that the control functions and the rights of the new body be considerably broadened.

It is noteworthy that the Central Control and Auditing Commission will be elected by a CPSU Congress and will be accountable to it, whereas the incumbent Party Control Commtitee is formed by the CPSU Central Committee.

The standing of the commission will be apparently higher. This determines its rights.

While the tasks of the Party Control Committee now amount to verifying observance of party discipline by CPSU members and considering appeals against party bodies' decisions concerning penalties, the future Central Control and Auditing Commission will begin to monitor the implementation of the programmatic documents and rules of the party, decisions of congresses and conferences, the state of party discipline and the observance of ethical norms by communists.

The draft statute stipulates that the commission "shall take measures against red tape, subjectivism, arbitrariness, and the influence of private and chance circumstances on party politics."

The Central Control and Auditing Commission of the CPSU shall exercise control over the observance of the collective nature decision making by executive bodies of the CPSU Central Committee, appeals against these decisions if they were taken with violation of the CPSU rules and do not correspond to the party's programme documents or to the country's current legislation," the draft statute says.

For a long time the party control body did not have such wide powers.

The draft statute clearly stipulates the rights and duties of the commission with regard to the CPSU Central Committee and party organisations.

The principle of selection of candidates for commission membership may also be mentioned as an important and democratic novelty.

Members of the Party Control committee were virtually appointed by the leadership of the Central Committee whereas commission members will be elected by congress from among communists recommended for that by the communist parties of the union republics, party bodies and organisations at the local level.

From now on commission members will not be able to be members of other central elective bodies of the party. The commission will elect a bureau that will consist of commission co-chairmen.

The draft statute also determines the auditing functions of the commission.

And, finally, there is yet another quite important novel feature: The Central Control and Auditing Commission "conducts its work openly and its decisions shall be published in the party press," the draft statute stipulates.

Social Democrats Urge Break With Party

AU0904103690 Paris AFP in English 0959 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 9 (AFP)—The Soviet Union's recently formed Social-Democratic Movement, a political party in all but name, has called on the government to renounce its allegiance to the Communist Party.

At a two-day meeting held in Moscow over the weekend, some 200 delegates from 52 towns called for the Army, the KGB and other ministries to answer to the state rather than to the party now that parliament has abolished the communists' monopoly on power, spokesman Pavel Gutionov said.

The Social-Democratic Movement, which claims the backing of 40,000 people, including that of 70 members of the 2,250-strong Congress of People's Deputies, also called for immediate negotiations between Moscow and Vilnius on Lithuanian independence.

The Supreme Soviet in Moscow should recognize Lithuania's unilateral declaration of independence and set about establishing a treaty which would enable both sides to maintain good relations, the resolution said.

Military Parade To Mark Victory Over Fascism

LD0904081790 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 9 Apr 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS—For the first time in five years a military parade across Red Square will mark the victory over fascism, on May 9.

A tent town accomodating participants in the parade was pitched at the capital's central airfield at the end of March. Foot columns and combat hardware drills take place there every day.

"A military parade, a festive civilian demonstration and an artillery salute—all are important elements of the celebration of our historic victory," Lieutenant General Nikolay Smirnov, military commandant of Moscow, told TASS.

The commandant's service is assigned to maintain order during the parade in Red Square.

A mock-up of the monument to Soviet liberators in Berlin's Treptow Park, will roll across the cobbles of Red Square.

A company of drummers will usher in a military march-past. Then the banner of victory, followed by the pennants of fronts that distinguished themselves during the war, will be carried.

A massed regiment of participants in the 1945 parade—heroes of the Soviet Union, the holders of the Order of Glory of all the three classes, war veterans, home front workers, partisans and underground resistance fighters—will march past, followed by a massed regiment of servicemen. "That will conclude the historical part of the parade," smirnov said.

Then officer cadets from military academies, cadets of military schools and columns of pupils from Sovorov and Nakhimov military and naval colleges will march.

Foot columns will be followed by combat hardware. Motorised rifle, airborne, tank, artillery, anti-aircraft missile, and missile troops will all march past, he said.

"The famous 'Katyusha' rockets, T-34 tanks and artillery of World War Two vintage will rumble across Red Square cobbles along with modern hardware. The parade will be concluded as usual by a march-past of a massed military brass band," Smirnov said.

Militia Uncovers Bomb Factory, Illegal Weapons

LD0904100890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] Officers of the Moscow Oblast militia have made safe an entire underground laboratory for the manufacture of explosives and all manner of bombs. Militia Major General (Belin) chief of the Main Directorate for Internal Affairs of the Moscow Oblast Executive Committee, told journalists: What we have uncovered could without any exaggeration be termed a laboratory of death. The weapons being produced were destined for organized criminal groupings. In fact, seizures of weapons from just such groupings in Podolskiy, Serpukhovskiy and Chekhovskiy rayons on the outskirts of Moscow a few days ago yielded 48 mortar shells, including some large-caliber ones, as well as 55 hand-held anti-tank grenades, 19 shells of various calibers, and other weaponry. These criminals certainly arm themselves well—the only thing missing was a cannon! Not long ago a group was arrested; automatic weapons fitted with silencers—as usually supplied to special units—and with sniper sights were confiscated. Such weapons are stolen from military units or from those serving in paramilitary guard units, or by attacking militiamen. Just why these criminals manufacture these lethal weapons and to whom they were selling them are questions for which investigations are now under way.

Yakovlev, Bakatin on Presidential Council

LD0604183490 Moscow TASS in English 0935 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—"The Soviet Presidential Council is a sort of collective brain trust under the president of the USSR. Of course, it is not a monopolist. There are other bodies, too," Aleksander Yakovlev, a member of the Presidential Council, told TASS.

"The purpose of the Presidential Council is to serve as an advisory organ under the country's new presidential institute of power," he said. "Its duty is to help shape and carry out the president's line as part and parcel of the Soviet state's policy and to discharge his separate assignments. The Council will analyse the situation in the country and study individual acute or most complicated political situations and problems that may crop up in the country and abroad."

"The right to choose and decide belongs to the president in all cases," Yakovlev stressed. "The Council's right and duty is to analyse or draw up proposals, to advance recommendations and raise problems on its own initiative."

"The Presidential Council is a consultative body that will help the president make decisions. But the decision will always be made by the president himself," noted Vadim Bakatin, member of the Presidential Council and Soviet interior minister.

"Our prime duty is to be up to our task. Secondly, we must not try to guess the president's views. We must be able to convince him. We must realise that not every decision of the president will be first submitted to the Council."

Baratin expressed the view that the Presidency was the most effective form of combining legislative and executive powers. He also said he was disturbed about the argument of advocates of the Presidency that a strong president was needed to enforce law and order. "This is a very simplified and erroneous approach. No matter how strong the president is, he can never afford to violate the law. But, at the same time, he should not allow anyone else to breach the law."

"I believe," Bakatin continued, "that the clear course towards a resolute radicalisation of all walks of life—from economy to politics—upon which the president has embarked, will earn him great support and will make possible additional concrete steps to raise the efficiency of the entire law enforcement system. And this will definitely help raise the efficiency of our struggle against crime."

"The fact that the Council includes a farmer, a worker, respectable authors and a noted economist, in addition to professional politicians, shows that the Presidency will act on behalf of the people and for the people," Presidential Council member worker Venyamin Yarin, told TASS.

He supported President Gorbachev's ideas and reforms and said he hoped to be useful to the president.

Further on Maslennikov's 3 Apr Press Briefing

PM0504142390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Parliamentary correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev report: "Power and Glasnost. USSR President's Press Service Set Up"]

[Text] A.A. Maslennikov, head of the USSR president's press service, met Soviet and foreign journalists in the Kremlin 3 April. He briefed mass media representatives in detail about the activity of the new organs—the Presidential Council and the Federation Council. Their first sittings took the form of a free and open debate, and became memorable events in the country's political life. The next Presidential Council sitting, Maslennikov said, will be devoted to problems of economic policy. Yu.D. Maslyukov, chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], will deliver a report there. It is quite possible that this sitting will be enlarged—prominent economists, scientists, and economic managers will take part in it in addition to members of the Presidential Council.

If we are talking about the work of the new bodies, the press service leader stressed, it must be said that they are now being prepared for action.

In the 18 days since the president's election, his attention has focused on all aspects of the country's political, economic, social, and cultural life. M.S. Gorbachev reacts trenchantly and promptly to any facts, events, trends, and processes which affect the mood within the country and even the fate of individuals. His attention was drawn, in particular, to the hunger strike proclaimed by a group of people involved in eliminating the accident at Chernobyl, and to the complex environmental situation in Monchegorsk, 11,000 of whose inhabitants sent M.S. Gorbachev a collective message. The government has been given the appropriate instructions on all these cases.

Let me say something about another instruction which the president gave in response to a letter sent to MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA by a group of Great Patriotic War veterans. They proposed that commemorative coins be issued on 9 May in honor of the great military leader Marshal of the Soviet Union G.K. Zhukov. The president supported this idea and instructed the government and the USSR Ministry of Finance to examine the question of issuing a set of coins honoring frontline commanders in the final stages of the Great Patriotic War.

A.A. Maslennikov described the USSR president's activity in the international sphere and answered numerous questions put by Soviet and foreign journalists. One question concerned defense industry conversion. The press secretary pointed out that very complex problems are cropping up in the conversion process. Representatives of the military industry and aviation workers complain that they are sometimes forced to manufacture output for which their plants are not suited. All this will be examined carefully by the Presidential Council.

In the United States and other countries with a presidential system of government, the person appointed to the post of presidential press secretary plays a large role in political life. That is why journalists asked Maslennikov detailed questions about what he did prior to his appointment to this high position. Arkadiy Afrikanovich is 58 years old, he is a member of the CPSU, and an economist by training. He devoted almost 25 years to international journalism—he was PRAVDA's own correspondent in India, Pakistan, and Britain. Until recently he was head of the USSR Supreme Soviet Press Center.

Inter-Regional Group's Record Examined

PM0604163490 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 14, 3-9 Apr 90 pp 8-9

[Nikolay Andreyev article: "A Tough Lot. Why Is There No Parliamentary Opposition?"]

[Text] The inter-regional group of deputies met the morning after the congress was over. The mood was sombre. We have lost.... We have no leader.... We must review our ranks.... We have degenerated into a debating club.... We are demoralized and have lost heart....

Nothing is more frustrating than not to be understood or to be wrongly understood. That is what the members of the group feel. They are often accused of thirsting for power. On the other hand, scarcely is there a political force, which would not want that. However, the group did not have that in mind. Most of its members are realists.

"Suppose we had the country handed over to us," people's deputy Aleksandr Obolenskiy said. "We simply wouldn't be able to cope, as we are not that well oranized."

Why, then, the group, if it doesn't want to take over? It wants to be an opposition. It wants to voice views conflicting with the majority. It wants to criticize and to be criticized. It wants to put the laws enacted to the acid test.

Only recently the very word "opposition" aroused fury. Nothing was more terrible than to oppose the majority. "Take heed!" Vladimir Stepanov, head manager of a Karelian animal-breeding state farm, implored from the rostrum of the First Congress of People's Deputies of the U.S.S.R. "What we've got to do is to feed the people and put the economy on a healthy footing! But you merely confuse matters, distracting the Congress from vital issues." Imagine they did "take heed," that they stop objecting or putting forward their own proposals. What then? Recall the times of unanimity still fresh in our memory. Did they offer much happiness? Did unanimity feed the people and put the economy on a healthy footing? When the supreme soviet opened, it was realized at last that dissent did not necessarily mean criminal intent to subvert monolithic unity. A different draft law proposed did not mean a cover-up for base cravings. It was said that there could be a dissenting view, but it had to be constructive. Surely opposition is constructive for parliamentary activity.

An opposition, whatever the field, not only in parliament, is more than desirable, it is essential. Otherwise you have a monopoly with all its concomitants of ambition, smug complacency and suppression of thought generally, let alone dissent. In short, stagnation, that kind of stagnation in every aspect of life, whose adverse effect we have felt out of our own bitter experience. Perestroyka is actually open opposition to stagnation. However, that does not at all mean society is of one mind as to how to effect change. The new deal has its opponents. Which is normal. The absence of dissent and opposition at the Congress of People's Deputies and in the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet would be abnormal. By denying the opposition the right to speak, indeed the very right to exist, the overwhelming majority is unconstructive.

The inter-regional group stood forth as the bulwark of opposition hopes. Recall how it emerged. At the fourth session of the First Congress, Gavriil Popov took the floor to say that as the majority was loath to count with the minority, he proposed establishing an independent interregional group of deputies. Popov and his supporters were accused of schism and then of every mortal sin. "Beware, the people see what you are doing, and will most likely vent their anger against you," one deputy warned. "We have people who are seeming incapable of living without factionalism. He will fall ill tomorrow if not given the chance," deputy Aleksandr Samsonov diagnosed, suggesting a court of honour.

The interim after the First Congress was the inter-regional group's heyday. It assumed organizational form numbering some 400 People's Deputies. The enthusiasm was great, the group planning to draft and table alternative draft laws in Parliament. Yet, Boris Yeltsin, one of the group's co-chairman, told a NEW TIMES correspondent: "The deputies in the group have no intention of placing themselves in opposition to anyone. On the contrary, the group is open to everyone who is dissatisfied with the hazy, uncertain character of the decisions taken, to everyone aware of the danger of pressure from dogmatic conservative forces."

Actually the group was more in the nature of a debating club offering every opportunity for unrestricted pronouncement on every subject, for any radical proposal. But what followed? Where were the alternative projects? Some were drafted, but as their passage through the parliamentary committees and commissions is of a mysterious, and not always comprehensible, character, neither hide nor hair was left. Then even if the group did evolve one or another stand, that did not mean that in the Supreme Soviet or at the Congress its members would fight tooth and nail for it. An opposite instance was afforded by the group's nomination of Aleksey Kazannik to stand for Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet. He polled only 75 votes.

In short, we don't have an opposition as yet. The inter-regional group failed to set it up de facto. Though without an opposition, one cannot really take lawmaking seriously. Yet the opposition cannot be decreed by fiat. After all, respect for an unusual idea, heed for another's opinion, tolerance towards a dissident cannot be introduced by edict. Yet such is the mood which should prevail in society. To my great regret, we do not have that as yet. Hence the moment dissent is voiced, the person in question is at once accused of schism and by stamping feet and clapping hands is booed off the rostrum. Or somebody takes the floor and, overcome with hatred, exclaims, addressing Andrey Sakharov: "I convey universal contempt for you." In that sort of atmosphere not only opposition, but even the elementary airing of one's own views is out of question.

Whatever the case, the inter-regional group is still neither opposition nor focus for rallying radical paraliamentary forces.

Soviet Constitutional Democrats To Form Party

LD0504085590 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 4 Apr 90

[Text] After the founding congress in Moscow last week of the Soviet Liberal Democratic Party the Soviet Constitutional Democrats have announced plans to form a party of their own. (Sergey Khrabu) of our staff has the details:

The Union of Constitutional Democrats was founded last year. It's been publishing a newspaper called CIVIC DIGNITY. The union claims to be a successor to the

Constitutional Democratic Party, also called People's Freedom, which existed in Russia back in 1906 and 1917. The party worked for nonviolent development of the country through liberal parliamentary reforms and it was one of the largest in Russia. Member of the Executive of the modern Constitutional Democrats, (Georgiy Deragin), says the ideas of the People's Freedom Party are still relevant today: Constitutional democracy is a social pattern where all activities of state bodies are governed by law, approved by the nation, and protecting the inviolable personal rights of every citizen.

The Constitutional Democrats are campaigning for coexistence of various forms of property and many political parties. They profess nonviolence in politics. They call themselves the opponents of the Communist Party and have a lot of differences with it. And yet, (Georgiy Deragin) says, they are ready to cooperate with the communists: As the Soviet people are building a democratic state they must upkeep order and prevent chaos. The Constitutional Democrats feel obliged to back every effort for preserving stability in spite of their political and ideological differences with other partes. That stand determines the union's attitude to the Lithuanian events. It supports in principle Lithuania's bid for independence. But it says the recent steps by Lithuanian leaders are hasty, not very sensible, and may have serious repercussions.

The Constitutional Democratic Union has announced plans to hold a founding congress in May. According to (Georgiy Deragin), in the first year of its existence it earned respect and emerged as a real force, that earns it the name of a political party: We've built an extensive information (?base). People hearing our views or at least claiming to do so live in some 80 cities around the country. Recently our representatives published their articles in some central newspapers.

Liberal Democratic Party Tasks, Aims Viewed

LD0804224190 Moscow TASS in English 1616 GMT 8 Apr 90

[By TASS corespondent Kyrill Dibrova]

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—"We have no ideology to expound. Our sole theory is common sense," Chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union (LPDSU) Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, a 42-year-old Moscow lawyer, told the recent first national congress of the party.

His political opponents, however, would not be content with this explanation: How can a party exist without an ideological foundation?

Nevertheless, the leaders of the party continue pressing just for this—deideologisation as their main economic and political demand. "All state structures should be completely deideologised," Zhirinovskiy insists. "Only under these conditions will the state be able to serve all its citizens irrespective of their political views. And only under these conditions will other provisions of the LDPSU programme be implementable—A multi-party system, multistructure economy, the supremacy of the law and the practical presidential government."

Although some people feel attracted by the demand for deideologisation in the LDPSU programme, practice has shown that most view this lack of explicit ideological commitment with apprehension.

This is most probably the explanation of its narrow membership—according to the party leaders it has only 3,000 members.

Nevertheless, the party chairman is confident that in conditions of equality, the LDPSU will grow into a multi-million party within a year or two.

He recalls that the Congress of Soviet People's Deputies amended a number of articles in the Soviet Constitution to pave the way to a multi-party system. Liberal democrats will be among the first new political parties registered in the Soviet Union.

The LPDSU is liberal not only judging by its programme, but also by its inner party organisation. Fees will amount to one per cent of a member's income. But, Zhirinovskiy said, no one will ever verify the size of members's incomes. Any citizen may join the party, even if he is already a member of another political party. Many would say this is not consistent with common sense.

Prospects of Springtime Strike 'Offensive' Viewed

PM0504130790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 90 p 1

[Ye. Zhirnov report: "Springtime Offensive?"]

[Text] Reports coming out in the past few days testify to the continuing buildup of social tension. Once again, like last fall, the barometer of the strike movement has started shifting toward the "overcast" mark.

On 3 April, 150 drivers from "Severovostokzoloto" Association in the Atka Settlement refused to go to work. They demanded an increase in wages and a change of the leadership which, in their opinion, ignores the working people's interests. In the city of Susaman in the selfsame Magadan Oblast, the trade union came over to the side of those who insisted on increased supplementary payments for the harmful working conditions of fitters in Berlekhskiy Motor Vehicles Combine.

The outcome of these conflicts is unknown for the time being, but miners from 4/10 and "Sevryugovka" Mines of "Rostovugol" Association's Krasnodonetsk Combine have already achieved their aim—Sundays are now days off for everyone. But it seems as if the use of strikes as a lever to pressurize the administrative structures is becoming popular not just in workers' collectives. In Kemerovo, for example, an authorized rally was held by sports workers who decided to go on strike if their demands for higher wages and more money to be spent on the needs of physical culture and sport were not met.

One recalls how, in times past, we were regularly informed of Western workers' seasonal periods of struggle for their rights. Is a sprintime offensive being launched in our country, too?

Deputy Discusses Psychiatric 'Abuse'

LD0604185990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 5 Apr 90

[Excerpts] "Psychiatry and Politics—What Has Changed?" was the name of a program we broadcast 25 December 1989. We are continuing our discussion of this topic. Here is a report by journalist Tatyana Kuropayeva:

[Begin recording] [Kuropayeva] Over two months have passed since our last program. We are continuing to receive letters and reactions from listeners. The letters vary, but almost all of them contain empathy and tremendously sincere interest in the fate of those people about whom we spoke. These people found themselves in psychiatric hospitals, not because they were ill or dangerous to society: They ended up there because they were a nuisance to somebody, because they witnessed somebody's illegal actions, refused to accept this, and tried in one way or another to resist arbitrary behavior. [passage omitted]

In my view, a positive effect will only come when we create a truly law-based state, in which everybody will be equal before the law, with a capital "L." I decided that the best person to talk to on this subject was the writer, Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, who is a USSR people's deputy.

[Medvedev] The abuse of psychiatry is continuing even now. Involved as I am in checking on the law enforcement organs, the militia and investigative bodies from within the Supreme Soviet, I encounter such cases. The system was closed even before. Doctors used to back each other up even before. Doctors will hardly ever expose another doctor. As regards the use of psychiatry for political and social purposes, a number of new regulations have been adopted during the last two years. The system of special psychiatric hospitals has been abolished. Everything has been handed over to the Ministry of Health. As far as I know, such units within the KGB have indeed been closed.

However, judging by the correspondence I receive, there is still something left over. I receive letters from people who are clearly absolutely healthy, but who got drawn into this psychiatric machine and have still not managed to extricate themselves from it.

[Kuropayeva] The way in which your brother was treated was also a case of psychiatry being used for political purposes, was it not?

[Medvedev] Of course. But at that time it was a habitual occurrence. My acquaintance, Bovin, who was Brezhnev's assistant at that time, reported to him one morning: Leonid Ilich, the well-known scientist, Medvedev, has been taken to (?Obdinskiy). We are only harming ourselves by doing this. He is very well known throughout the world. Brezhnev didn't get on the telephone to Petrovskiy, the minister of health, to find out what had happened to Medvedev. Instead, he telephoned Andropov of the KGB. Andropov already knew about it, as Bovin writes. Andropov replied: It's probably the boys from the directorate of excessive zeal who are responsible for this; one of the directorates is being over-diligent. In other words, everybody understood that this was nothing to do with psychiatrists. It was the work of some KGB official, either in Moscow or Kaluga.

But this was a widespread practice at that time. Probably some secret decision had been made to allow psychiatry to be used for punitive purposes. I think that it is continuing, but not on the same scale as before. Now it's tied in with certain local interests. Sometimes it is very important to somebody to commit some kind of abuse of psychiatry. People back each other up. But this is no longer based on government decisions. It is no longer a policy of repression by the government. Political repressions have virtually ceased, although there are of course political detainees still. But they are usually arrested on other counts, for violations of public order, for (?resisting) the militia, in accordance with warrants which are obtained. People find themselves in prisons or camps for political reasons. The possibility of judicial, procuratory, psychiatric, political, and other abuses still exists, of course.

[Kuropayeva] Roy Aleksandrovich, how then can we work out a system of guarantees?

[Medvedev] A system of guarantees will come when we have a law-based society. As the legal profession develops, so must an independent psychiatric service. Psychiatry needs private psychiatric counsellors, private psychiatrists, and private neuropathologists who can be consulted.

[Kuropayeva] The independent International Psychiatric Reserach Center has now been established, but official medical circles simply do not want to recognize it. They are doing their utmost to discredit and compromise it.

[Medvedev] Society needs the protection and development of private psychiatry and independent expertise. This has been acknowledged, but it depends on the Ministry of Health, the government, and society itself. [end recording]

ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Editor Interviewed

PM0404125790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with V.A. Starkov, chief editor of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, by own correspondent R. Armeyev under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "Best Newspaper of 1989. That Is How British Journalists Saw the Soviet Weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY"—date and place unspecified, first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] At the traditional annual ceremony in London, where the flower of British journalism was gathered, the results of the "What the Papers Say" competition, which has been held for many years by British journalists and publishers, were announced. Prestigious prizes, awards, and titles are given to the editor of the year, the commentator, the reporter...and the newspaper of the year. This time the honored title was won by the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. In a ceremonial atmosphere Bernard Weatherill, speaker of the House of Commons, presented Chief Editor V.A. Starkov with a silver diploma confirming the title.

On his return from Britain V.A. Starkov answered questions from an IZVESTIYA correspondent. [passage omitted]

[Armeyev] Do you believe that your hard times are over?

[Starkov] Who can guarantee that?...

[Armeyev] But isn't the failure of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY to appear in certain parts of the country on the pretext of a lack of paper just a continuation of these "games"?

[Starkov] I don't think so. Even PRAVDA, the party's central press organ, has publicly complained about the paper shortage. This is a sign of the crisis in our economy... But, of course, we must not lose our vigilance—journalists have a hard [sapernyy] job to do.

[Armeyev] Your position has considerably strengthened following the elections to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. It seems that five ARGUMENTY I FAKTY editorial office staffers have become people's deputies?

[Starkov] Yes, five, plus one who became a Moscow City Soviet deputy.

[Armeyev] Does this mean that there will be some collective proposals and actions?

[Starkov] We are currently assembling our deputies' group and looking for like-minded people—we'll have to think about what we should do... But I'd like to take this opportunity to say that with our huge circulation we consider ourselves to be a people's newspaper and therefore we cannot allow ourselves to join any camp. We are a newspaper of the center, perhaps of the center-left. We have well-organized links with readers and we receive sacks of letters every day. Readers are our voice and we are the readers' voice. We clearly realize our responsibility. We can see that the people themselves are by no means extremist—they advocate a stable state, they are against civil war, they advocate that their children grow up in peace. But politicians have to seek and earn funds in order to stop the worst disasters breaking out in our country. That is very important. And we will strive to help to stabilize public opinion so as to channel it in a peaceful and calm direction... Yes, you know that I myself have a 10-year-old, a small girl, a daughter... [passage omitted]

Economic

USSR Price Reform To Take Place in Jan 1991

AU0604170390 Paris AFP in English 1551 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 6 (AFP)—A price reform will take effect in the Soviet Union as of January 1 next year, according to Ivan Gorbachev, the deputy head of the Soviet state commission on prices. Mr. Gorbachev, quoted Friday by INTERFAX, a Moscow Radio publication, said that wholesale and purchasing prices had already been agreed by ministries and that the government was currently looking into ways of compensating low-income earners for rising prices. Inflation, he said, reached 7.5 per cent last year and could increase initially next year. This would however not be too bad a problem providing there were enough consumer goods on the market to satisfy demand, he added.

Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov recently acknowledged in an interview with INTERFAX that price increases were on the way.

The oil and gas ministry recently acknowledged that petrol prices would be increased starting next year.

Economic Reform Body Chairman on Market Economy

LD0604224190 Moscow TASS in English 1639 GMT 6 Apr 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The introduction of a market economy in the Soviet Union will probably occur much sooner than expected. The work on a programme to switch the economy to market-oriented relations is now in progress in both the parliament and the government, Valentin Vologzhin, chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Economic Reform Matters, told TASS today.

The programme is expected to become the subject of consideration at a session of the Presidential Council in the coming days. A transition to market relations, originally planned by the government programme for 1993-1995 should be carried out in 1990-1991, he said.

Vologzhin spoke in favour of ensuring that a legislative basis of a new model of the economy be laid this year. Then 1991 will become the first year of entering into market, he added.

Vologzhin regards a reform of the price formation system as the most sore point in the transition programme. He believes that a market system in the Soviet Union should mean free prices of a large part of the means of production and consumer goods.

He emphasised the need to ensure the protection of groups of the population with fixed incomes. Otherwise, he maintains "the situation in the country may become ungovernable."

The committee chairman also called for renouncing a tough directive planning and for the freedom for producers—irrespective of the form of ownership—to sell their products on both domestic and foreign markets. He believes that a stage-by-stage devaluation of the rouble with respect to other currencies will also be needed.

Vologzhin admits that a turn of such magnitude cannot be utterly painless. But without it, there is no hope of bringing the living standards in the Soviet Union up to those of the developed countries. All attempts to postpone the decisive step "make the reforms more difficult," he believes.

Industrial Output Decline Continues in March

PM0804172990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Romanyuk article under the "Statistics and Our Commentary" rubric: "First Quarter: No Acceleration As Yet"]

[Text] According to rapidly assembled reporting data which the USSR State Committee for Statistics has at its disposal to date, rates of production continued to fall in March. Industry produced 1.6 percent less output than last March.

"If we are talking about the first quarter as a whole," V. Tolkushkin, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, said, "the volume of production was 1.2 percent down on the level of the first quarter of last year. The same unfavorable factors were at work in March just as in January and February—namely, the tense political situation in the Transcaucasus, a drop in production volumes in the defense complex owing to conversion, which was not fully compensated by the production of nonmilitary output, and the mass shutdown—owing to public demand—of environmentally hazardous production units. Moreover all these factors very greatly affected the status of heavy industry (Group "A" production volumes dropped by three percent against the first quarter of last year).

Before specifically analyzing the negative processes taking place in the national economy, let us note some positive trends. They are not as yet radically changing the figures but they may play a stabilizing role in the future. Firstly, working life in Azerbaijan is returning to normal. Whereas in the first two months of this year, we had a 40-percent drop there, in March two percent more output was produced than in March 1989. A modest figure, but one that is extremely reassuring. The return from defense complex conversion is rising: During the period January-March commodity production increased by 20 percent here against the corresponding period last year and by 14 percent with regard to equipment for the light and food industries, the agro-industrial complex, and public catering.

In machine building production of progressive types of equipment has increased. Thus growth rates for the production of multiple machine tool complexes [obrabatyvayushchiy tsentr] and forging and pressing machines with digital program control were double those for metal cutting and pressing equipment as a whole. The motor vehicle industry has finally overcome stagnation: Almost 20,000 more automobiles were manufactured than in the first quarter of last year. But machine builders did not even attain the level of the first quarter of last year in respect of a number of important products: Production of AC electric motors was down seven percent and production of petroleum industry equipment and buses was down 12 percent.

Breaches of contract commitments have done considerable damage to the national economy. For industry as a whole in the period January-March they were 98.7 percent fulfilled (99.4 percent in the first quarter of 1989), including 98.9 percent for the fuel and energy complex, 98.7 percent for machine building and metallurgy, 97.9 percent for the chemical and timber complex, and 98 percent in light industry. Economic losses totaled R2.5 billion owing to this (R1.1 billion in the first quarter of 1989).

The most backward—the chemical and timber complex—failed to supply contracted output worth R0.6 billion. Out of 31 basic types of output on which up-to-the-minute accounts are kept, the production of 26 was allowed to fall, including production of caustic soda and synthetic rubber, timber, mineral fertilizers, and sulfuric acid. Lack of coordination between individual production facilities in this sector persists.

The situation in the metallurgical complex is somewhat better: Rolled metal production has dropped by two percent against the level of the first quarter of 1989. One in three enterprises in the sector failed to provide supplies of the target range of goods, totaling almost R0.25 billion as a whole.

Despite all the disorder in the first quarter of the year, industry's efforts had a noticeable social slant. Consumer goods production increased by 6.4 percent (R7 billion at retail prices). But for all three months running the average monthly wage exceeded the level of January-March 1989 by nine percent. Let us recall that the program for economic recovery and the stabilization of the market envisages an increase in consumer goods production of more than R60 billion in 1990. It goes without saying that a kind of flying start is needed to resolve this task. And yet it has to be stated that production growth rates in the first quarter of the year were only half the level that it is planned to achieve by the end of the year.

Now to be specific: Cultural-consumer goods, high-technology domestic equipment, and household goods showed the greatest increase. In the first quarter of 1990—against the corresponding period last year—production of washing and sewing machines increased by 14 percent, color televisions and tape recorders by 11 percent, radio receivers by 12 percent, and cameras by 10 percent. Efforts were made to overcome the "removal" from the product range of daily essentials that had become scarcities. Admittedly, individual failures were noted in this group of goods: Production of safety razor blades, toothpaste, etc. dropped once again.

There have been no marked changes in light industry. Admittedly, five percent more hosiery, eight percent more jackets, and three percent more raincoats were produced than in the first quarter of last year. However, production volumes dropped for 12 out of 25 types of goods in the rush report, including fabrics, towels, and footwear.

An enterprise's economic health can be judged above all by the production rhythm. The last week of March accounted for 24 percent of the total month's worktime. But in this period 44 percent of the monthly program of tape recorders, 41 percent of radio receivers, 35 percent of washing machines (including 65 percent at the Frunze Experimental Electrovacuum Machine Building Plant and 63 percent at Odessa Pressmash facility) were produced. In the last working week 58 percent of the monthly program for metal-cutting tools were manufactured, along with 32 percent of bearings, 44 percent of excavators, 30 percent of electric motors for domestic appliances, and 75 percent of freightcars (including 78 percent at the Riga Freightcar Construction Plant, 74 percent at the Kalinin Freightcar Construction Association, and 59 percent at "Talleks).

As we can see, the first quarter of the year in the implementation of the program for the stabilization of the market and economic recovery has not yielded the expected results. It is futile to continue to bank on breakneck work and coercive methods. However "extraordinary" the planned measures are, they will remain mere declarations within the framework of the old economic mechanism. And this has been confirmed by the results of the period January-March 1990.

Scientific

'Cosmos' Satellites Launched 6 Apr

LD0604125990 Moscow TASS in English 1249 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—Eight artificial earth satellites—"Cosmos-2064", "Cosmos-2065", "Cosmos-2066", "Cosmos-2067", "Cosmos-2068", "Cosmos-2069", "Cosmos-2070", and "Cosmos-2071"—were launched today by the Soviet Union with the use of the "Cosmos" rocket booster.

The satellites are carrying scientific equipment to continue space research.

They are moving in orbits with the initial parameters:—the period of rotation - 115 minutes.—the maximum distance from the earth surface (in the apogee) - 1,495 kilometers,—the minimum distance from the earth surface (in the perigee) - 1,437 kilometers,—the inclination of the orbit - 74 degrees.

In addition to the scientific equipment, the satellites are carrying radio systems to measure orbital elements and radio-telemetric systems to transmit information about the functioning of devices and scientific equipment to the earth.

The on-board equipment is functioning normally. The coordination and computer centre is processing the information.

Cosmonauts Study Space's Influence on Materials

LD0604213290 Moscow TASS in English 1055 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—By TASS special correspondent from the Mission Control Centre:

Over the past week Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin together with specialists from the Mission Control Centre tested various motion control regimes and prepared scientific equipment for forthcoming experiments.

They also continued studies of the influence of outer space on various materials with the help of equipment on the outer surface of the re-equipment module.

Today they will conduct experiments to evaluate structural material and elements of the radio-electronic equipment.

Last week the crew carried out many medical test, including with the use of ultrasonic equipment. According to the results, both cosmonauts are in good health.

Solovyev and Balandin continue to fulfil the flight programme.

Military

General on Anti-Aircraft Defense Capability

LD0604191790 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—Anti-aircraft defence troops are a purely defensive arm of the Soviet Armed Forces, Colonel-General Vladimir Litvinov, first deputy commander-in-chief of the troops, told TASS on the eve of a day devoted to anti-aircraft defence troops in the USSR.

Litvinov said that the troops include radio troops, anti-aircraft rocket troops and the fighter aviation.

Radio troops are intended to detect air targets, he explained, emphasising that they have up-to-date radar.

The fighter aviation consists of supersonic fighter-interceptor planes capable of flying in any weather. These planes can hit enemy air targets long before they approach facilities protected by the planes, the general said.

"Anti-aircraft rocket troops, equipped with powerful armaments, comprise the main firepower of the anti-aircraft defence forces," Litvinov pointed out.

Speaking about measures taken by the aircraft defence troops after West German Mathias Rust invaded Soviet airspace in a Cessna light plane, Litvinov said the measures were aimed at removing drawbacks in the functioning of the troops, revealed by that flight.

He said the anti-aircraft defence troops are seeking to improve their combat readiness. "The solution of this important task will prevent a decline in the level of the troops' combat readiness and make their work reliable and stable."

Air Defense Chief Tretyak Interviewed

LD0804203890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1100 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Interview by V. Vovnenko with Army General I.M. Tretyak, commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces—from the "Today is Air Defense Troops' Day" program]

[Text] [Vovnenko] Ivan Moiseyevich, you and I are here at the central command post. What is your measure of responsibility for the country's security?

[Tretyak] With my coming to the air defense troops, it seems to me that I have come to a position which requires me to work in the same way and with the same preparedness as during a war and with a second-by-second and minute-by-minute readiness to tackle combat tasks.

[Vovnenko] When we speak of reduction of the Armed Forces and conversion, to what extent does this effect the Air Defense Forces?

[Tretyak] The reduction of the Armed Forces and armaments fully applies to the Air Defense Forces also. Is this having an effect on the performance of alert duty? Yes, it is to some extent. We particularly felt this when we were discharging student servicemen, because approximately 60 percent of the students were located in the control bodies, and at first there were no one to replace them. Therefore we needed a certain amount of time to carry out a number of organizational measures and restore the combat readiness of the combat posts at all levels. Prior to this, naturally, the officers had to spend considerably more time performing alert duty, since there was no one to replace them. But now all these matters are behind us. We have trained replacements and the forces are now fully capable of performing their tasks as before.

I would like to say to you that the thaw that has been taking place throughout the world has in effect not yet permitted us, the Air Defense Forces, to relax to any degree the attention we pay to our work, because the NATO forces and the United States have not suspended a single scheduled program. They have not reduced their aircraft strength in a single theater of military actions, and both Mr Bush and the secretary of defense are stating that any talk about reductions should be approached very cautiously as regards the reduction of funds and the reduction of the Armed Forces. But the Air Force is being developed considerably. For instance, there has been the appearance of the B-2 aircraft with its stealth technology. There has also, for instance, been the appearance of the tactical Air Force fighter-bombers and of new ship-based aircraft made in line with new technology.

I repeat that the quantity of means of air attack has not been decreasing and, if one adds cruise missiles, there has been a considerable increase. Therefore the task of the Air Defense Forces, far from decreasing, is actually increasing. With the defense doctrine it is increasing. Indeed I do not know whether in the near future there may be some kind of a respite for us air defense troops.

[Vovnenko] What does the enemy [protivnik] have at his disposal? Potentially, let's say?

[Tretyak] At the current time the enemy has a significant number of aerospace weapons. I am thinking of strategic aviation. This is the B1 and B2 aircraft program; this is a huge number of carrier-borne aviation and tactical aviation in Europe and the Pacific zone; this is the development of cruise missiles on board ships and aircraft and land-based ones. Their number has not only not fallen, and is not falling, but is increasing, and will go on increasing. Furthermore, there is widespread employment in the West of high accuracy weapons used in combat, and these weapons are very dangerous for us and those forces and systems which will be in the immediate vicinity (?of the border), because our air defense systems, especially our surveillance systems, our radar complexes, will be put out of action in the very first hours. That means we won't be able to see. Our antiaircraft systems will not open fire. So I want to tell you that today, there is not only no decrease in the aerospace attack systems of our most likely presumed enemy, but just the opposite, an increase in all areas.

[Vovnenko] What's the state of that SDI system which for some reason we have fallen silent about recently?

[Tretyak] The leadership of the United States of America, and first and foremost the Defense Department, attaches great significance to SDI, of course, and that is natural. They have not given it up, nor are they doing so, and are continuing their work. And since the appearance of this theory, with the various names, the theory of smart pebbles, the theory of brilliant pebbles, the principle boils down to putting a significant quantity of small missiles on platforms into space, and using them to destroy an echelon of missiles launched in any direction, they calculate, and enable them to land and inflict defeat on the facilities they are covering. [sentence as heard] This is the main thing (?they are counting on), to create this umbrella, this shield."

[Vovnenko] The general [not further identified] who reported to you today that he was going on duty, what powers does he have today? [words indistinct] You can be called on by the Ministry of Defense, or perhaps you have your own tasks. What powers does he have?

[Tretyak] The general on duty, in the command post, in the absence of the commander in chief and head of staff, has the right to make decisions independently, reporting subsequently (?to the commander in chief), at any point, in any form.

[Vovnenko] At any point of the Soviet Union, regarding [words indistinct]

[Tretyak] He is fully trained for this.

[Vovnenko] What qualities are needed for such a person? Is the responsibility not too great for one person? What backups are there, if its not a secret?"

[Tretyak] Well, first he must be well-trained, with higher education. It is desireable that such a person should have held a number of positions before getting to the command position, and have practical experience, a huge amount of experience. The best thing is if the officer has served in aviation units. And, of course, that he should have qualities, be decisive, not fearing to take responsibility. That's the main thing. Now, all our duty generals are trained for this. But, I want to tell you that in all circumstances there is someone from the air defense troops command close to the person on duty, and he will definitely be able send a report. He will make a decision and will be able to report it.

Army, Navy Report, Election Meetings Summarized

PM0404154990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 90 First Edition p 1

[Colonel A. Glukhov report: "Initial Results"]

[Text] The results of the first report and election meetings in Army and Navy party organizations were summed up at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. A report was delivered by Major General A. Gorbachev, chief of the Main Political Directorate Organizational Party Work Directorate. Colonel General A. Shirinkin, senior secretary of the Main Political Directorate Party Commission, took part in the discussion of questions.

The conference was addressed by Colonel General N. Shlyaga, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Batlic Republics

Reportage on Takeover of Vilnius Press Palace

Staff To Defend Press Palace

LD0904095590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuania at 0900 GMT on 9 April carries a report by correspondent Miksys from the Press Palace in Vilnius. Miksys says that the working day at the Press Palace started normally, and that the staff members, although tired after the all-night vigil, were in high spirits and were determined to defend the Press Palace and ensure that the free press would not be disrupted.

Events Described

LD0804224290 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Even on Palm Sunday, the Soviet troops did not (?let Lithuania alone). Today again an attempt was made to use troops against unarmed people. At 4 AM, the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs was warned that Soviet troops would make an attempt to seize the press complex. [passage omitted]

About 7 AM, the press complex was encircled by soldiers. They had arrived in a dozen or so trucks. They were dressed in militiamen's uniforms, but part of them wore paratroopers' berets, and they were outfitted with shields and rubber sticks. The Lithuanian radio appealed to the residents to gather outside the building and to prevent the soldiers from entering it. Hundreds of people responded to the appeal, surrounding the soldiers. Presently Deputy Premier Algirdas Brazauskas and Minister of Internal Affairs Marijonas Misiukonis arrived, and following their talks with the servicemen, the soldiers returned to their trucks.

Department head of the Soviet Union's Ministry of Internal Affairs, General Vladimir (Maksimov), who led the action, explained that he was fulfilling Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov's order to protect the building. But one thing is to protect, and quite a different thing is to interfere in the affairs of the printing house, said Algirdas Brazauskas.

At the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs, attempts were made to hold talks with Gen. (Maksimov), to make hiw withdraw the soldiers, but he refused, intimating the refusal by his obeying orders. [passage omitted]

Union Chairman Interviewed

LD0804133390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1123 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] No doubt everyone is waiting for the news about the situation outside the Press Palace in Vilnius, which is the hottest spot in Lithuania at the moment. Guoda Salciute, program presenter at Lithuanian Radio, has this report.

[Salciute] Since this morning Lithuanian Radio has been informing listeners about the situation outside the Press Palace. No doubt listeners heard the reports and other urgent information and now I have here in the studio Domas Sniukas, chairman of the Lithuanian Journalists Union, who has just returned from the Press Palace. Now, you have the latest news. What is it?

[Sniukas] Yes, probably I do. I would say that at the moment the situation is normal. There are very many people there; they are having a very lively time there, they are singing songs, dancing folk dances. At the central entrance there is now a sort of Hyde Park [corner]. People came from Kaunas, Alytus, and Panevyzys to protect the Press Palace—they are voicing their ideas, they exchange information about the results of yesterday's elections, and so on.

I also went inside the Press Palace for a short while. Journalists, including a couple of foreign journalists who still remain there, are present. We can see the situation which is that of a seige, I would say. In some corridors firemen's water hoses are laid out in case a fire breaks out.

Those who are protecting the Press Palace are having their sandwiches and coffee. I would even say this looked like a cozy atmosphere. However, I must say that people are concerned about what is going to happen and how long they would have to stand there and so on.

Esteemed Treigys, deputy director of the publishing house, and I went to talk to people and this is, in short, what we told them, and we would also like to say this to our radio listeners: It seems that it would be advantageous if a considerable number of people kept vigil at the Press Palace permanently.

It seems that the servicemen assured that this action would not be repeated; however, this has already happened on more than one occasion, therefore, one must not believe their words. Because the weather is rather cold and there is the wind and no doubt not everybody can spare much time, we would suggest that those who had fulfilled their civic duty defending the free press go home and for other people to come to replace them. I would say that during the daytime people who live in some distant areas of Vilnius should come here and at night—say 2300 or at midnight—people who live here in the vicinity—within walking distance—especially young people, could come. I should say, lovers could also come here and do a useful job, too. So I think we would survive until tomorrow in this way, and tomorrow is a working day and we all will be there and we shall start talking again.

[Salciute] [passage omitted] What was the reason behind this action? What are the reasons? Is this simply a Sunday intimidation, I would say, because on Sundays we have tanks, or for example today we have a different kind of action—or is it something else?

[Sniukas] You see, the servicemen officially explained that they wanted to reinforce the guard a little. However, when 13 military vehicles full of soldiers arrive, one cannot seriously believe that this was only reinforcement of guards. Well, what this amount of soldiers could possibly do inside the building is not clear either. Therefore, according to most people who gathered there, this was a psychological war of nerves: Perhaps someone will provoke a scuffle, perhaps it would become possible to start the truncheons flailing and then these events could be escalated. It is very good that people are wise and behave with circumspection.

Yes, by the way, many people asked me if we wanted people outside television and radio and so on. I can tell that at the moment we are prepared to meet the visitors if they arrive. If such need arises we are sure that the esteemed listeners and viewers would support us.

And as chairman of the Lithuanian Journalists' Union, I am happy that our journalists currently are supporting one another really well. [passage omitted] So far as we have heard the military labelled us with names such as provocateurs and so on. Indeed, we do not want to provoke anyone. We want press that reflects various points of view to be published. [passage omitted] These matters should be solved simply by negotiations only.

Lithuanian Minister Comments

LD0804164590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1145 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Commentary by, and interview with, Marijonas Misiukonis, republic of Lithuania minister of internal affairs, by unidentified interviewer; place not given, on 8 April—live or recorded]

[Text] [Misiukonis] First and foremost, it should be said that the Press Palace is property which has not yet been divided, and so great disputes are constantly raging around this and other buildings; disputes that are sometimes bolstered by armed soldiers. Naturally enough, the people are rather disapproving of all servicemen, whatever they are doing; whether they are in transit, whether it is some sort of threat, whether it is helicopters flying over a rally dropping pamphlets, etc. And so, early this morning, when it was broadcast on the radio that the Press Palace was being taken over, I, as minister, my deputy, and the top rankers in the Ministry and Administration of Internal Affairs all, naturally, appeared on the scene, where we were met by a sight that made it clear that the military really was trying to use force to get into the Press Palace. The people were refusing to allow this action, this seizure. And it is very good that the military, the division from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs internal affairs organ, acted in a very intelligent fashion, so that violence was not employed. If violence had been employed, then of course that—in itself a bad thing—would have resulted in totally innocent people suffering.

I can tell you that women still in their nightclothes responded to the announcement that an attempt was being made to take the building! This goes to show that the people are ready to defend this building, and indeed the principle. These problems cannot be resolved by force. If there are disputes over property, then these disputes should be resolved using the established procedure. The militia will not get involved in dividing up property. The militia's job is to uphold order. And it is my job as minister to avert any clashes between the military and the civilian militia, to avoid bloodshed, to avoid negative processes. I should say that today the militia has found itself caught between the two constitutions: the Constitutions of the USSR and the Constitution of Lithuania. And therefore, these matters cannot be resolved by steps taken either by the militia or by the military. It is the politician and political forces that should stand between these constitutions and come to an agreement. Is is very easy to use the mechanism of pressure and force. But, it is the mechanism of politics and reason that should be paramount today.

[Interviewer] If we look at the clock just now, it shows 1237. You have just been in touch with the republic of Lithuania's militia [word indistinct], who are keeping order outside the Press Palace. What is the situation there at the moment?

[Misiuknis] The vehicles have departed for their base with servicemen. The people have remained behind. Today is Sunday, and they just want to have a good time. It should be said that the people could do nothing bad, or try anything on—any provocations. [sentence as received] We were there all the time, as was the first secretary [words indistinct] of the city committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party. I believe the people have a correct understanding of the situation, and have no wish to see a situation in Vilnius, or in Lithuania generally, which would result in force having to be employed; crude force, and even military force.

[Interviewer] So, has the Press Palace been occupied by the military, or are there still the same number of troops as prior to today?

[Mislukonis] There is a detail of soldiers in the Press Palace, as well as a detail of militia—that is, from the republic of Lithuania's Internal Affairs Ministry—as well as details of the voluntary people's militia. And so the same regime as before holds sway in the building. But, today the republic's Supreme Council Presidium held a conference with the military, and they came to the conclusion that we must dispense with these conditions. For after all, nobody has any intention of removing that building, or the property there! A normal dialogue between all political forces is needed, and I believe the matter can be resolved by means of talks and by means of human conversation. What use is force here? I fail to understand why force should be required! I believe that what is needed is human conversation between the various parties there, since (?aside from) the CPSU there are two parties in our republic. We need dialogue between these parties. I repeat: The militia will not get involved where the logic of politicians should prevail, and where there should be a peaceful way of resolving things.

[Interviewer] This morning the people outside the Press Palace were saying that this morning windows had been smashed in the printing house on Maironis Street. And, that the printing house had also been taken over by paratroopers.

[Misiukonis] Two days ago a window was smashed on Maironis Street, and a flaming object was thrown in. The result of this was that a fire started. Our fire engines arrived very quickly on the scene, and the fire was extinguished. But, somewhere in the region five tonnes of newsprint was ruined. We believe that this was done with intent. You heard my conversation with the duty officer: There are no paratroopers on Maironis Street.

[Interviewer] And what about the newspaper kiosk [word indistinct]?

[Misiukonis] Two days ago the window of this kiosk was broken, but I don't think anything in particular was touched there. As for the window-smashing, I think that was a case of petty hooliganism. We still have quite a bit of that in our republic.

[Interviewer] In order to resolve the question of the division of property between the Independent Communist Party of Lithuania and the Communist Party of Lithuania on the platform of the CPSU, do you think internal dialogue alone will be enough, that is, between the spokesman of the two parties that have been formed in place of the old single party? Or is the intervention—well, not intervention, but assistance—of Moscow required?

[Misiukonis] I can only give you my opinion as an ordinary man, a man whom you might have stopped in the street. Dialogue is required; there must be talks. At any rate, in my opinion there is a whole chain. There must be talks right across the board, from the top right down to the bottom rung. And if talks, peaceful talks, yield nothing, then the issue can always be resolved by judicial means. There is legislation; there are laws to deal with this. And you know, when a large number of people get involved in a problem.... Today, for example, at least 5,000 people congregated outside the Press Palace at the very least, including deputies from the Lithuanian parliament, USSR people's deputies, foreign journalists, and many other witnesses. And the question begs: Why is all this necessary? Are there really no political forces that can resolve it all in the language of politics?

More on Press Palace Incident

LD0804190490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Report by correspondent Gennadiy Kolenov in Vilnius]

[Text] For us, journalists, who work her in Vilnius, this Sunday morning started with an emergency visit to the scene of events, the Press Palace, the former publishing house of the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee. In the morning the republican radio reported that troops were occupying the building. When I arrived at the Vilnius Press Palace I saw, indeed, several vehicles with internal troops, people were picketing the entrance, but I must say, here in Lithuania demonstrations are distinguished by good order and restraint. The soldiers remained in the vehicles, and I did not notice any attempts to occupy the Press Palace. According to the explanations given to journalists by the officers who were present at the scene, somebody had broken several windows in the old building of the Press Palace and they had come here to ascertain that everything was in order. They did not have any plans at all for occupying the place. The incident was closed after the republican minister of internal affairs and Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the independent Communist Party of Lithuanian Central Committee, arrived at the scene. After, literally, two- minute talks, the vehicles with soldiers were removed. And how does the press service of the Ministry of Internal Affairs explain the five-hour presence of internal troops at the Press Palace: Journalists were told that 120 people, posing as printers, penetrated the building and tried to establish their posts, and the presence of the internal troops was necessary to maintain public order. The Lithuanian minister of internal affairs said in his interview with the republican radio that the incident was caused by the fact that the building that had earlier belonged to the Communist Party of Lithuania Central Committee simply has not yet been divided.

In my everyday contacts and meetings with Lithuanians on the streets and in public transport, I am always asking them the question: Is not the decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet a hasty one, especially as the process of radically reforming the Soviet Federation on a democratic basis has already started? Many of them, mostly workers and elderly people, say that the hastiness and rashness of the decisions adopted by the current Supreme Soviet of the republic is undeniable. One should not cut a live tissue or break off economic ties so quickly and resolutely. A gradual, step- by-step constructive dialogue is required. The confirmation of Lithuanian independence made by Vytautas Landsbergis at yesterday's rally contradicts the law of the country's Supreme Soviet on the rules for resolving issues relating to secession from the USSR. One should move along the path of enabling the people to express freely its will, along the path of referendum. This is what many Lithuanians with whom I have spoken recently think.

And something about yet another event that took place today. A rally at the initiative of the Yedinstvo public movement in support of the decisions by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the address by our country's president to the Lithuanian people and the Supreme Soviet of Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic took place in Klaipeda.

Volunteer Guards Detained

LD0704083790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Provocations in Lithuania continue. Last night soldiers of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs apprehended and locked up in the press building shelter a group of volunteers who came to guard the building. These volunteers have authorizations from the Supreme Council. They were subjected to psychological harassment and threatened with violence—even inside the building. Heads of the press building and of the publishing house and other civilians are being completely ignored. This afternoon the guards at the press building were reinforced.

'Thick Human Chain' Surrounds Press Building

LD0804121890 Warsaw Domestic Service in Polish 1005 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] A minute ago we received a telephone report from a Polish radio correspondent in Vilnius.

[Begin recording] [Wiernikowska] Maria Wiernikowska speaking from Vilnius for the midday magazine.

A thick human chain has surrounded the building of the Press House. Since dawn, the local radio has been issuing communiques on movements of troops which intend to take over the publishing and printing headquarters. Inhabitants of Vilnius were here earlier. The crowd of people who have decided to defend the Lithuanian free press from Soviet interference has been growing since this morning.

Fearing provocation, special law and order stewards are separating the people waiting here from the trucks with soldiers. In one of the trucks one can see plastic shields piled up. People are arriving with banners, radio receivers, and thermos flasks. Sometimes the freezing soldiers get something as well.

Yesterday at the Vingis Stadium 300,000 people replied to Mikhail Gorbachev's appeal. A low-flying military helicopter showered leaflets over the heads of the people gathered there to remind them of the president's appeal. The crowd of many thousands shouted "Disgrace" at the helicoper. The leaflets urged the Lithuanians to come to their senses and immediately revoke the separatists' illegal decisions.

"March 11 is the beginning of the end of the empire," was a reply given by a celebrated guest from Moscow, Yuriy Afanasyev, a historian and a deputy.

"You don't need a referendum to be born free," I read on one of the banners. And also: "Freedom is dearer than life," and "For our freedom and yours." Please listen to what a Lithuanian woman I met in the crowd told me:

[Unidentified female, in Polish] Now the entire republic can watch Polish television. Not only your fellow countrymen who live in Vilnius and its vicinity but also we Lithuanians can watch Polish television. We know about the attitude of your government and nation to our decision [sounds of crowds singing in Lithuanian heard in background] and we don't (?doubt) that your nation will also support our decision. [end recording]

Pickets Urged To Remain Outside Press Building

LD0804085690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0833 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Unscheduled announcement]

[Text] This is Vilnius, Lithuanian Radio's first program. We briefly interrupt the program "Juvents" to make an announcement about the situation outside the Press Palace in Vilnius.

We have received information that military vehicles which drove away from the Press Palace did not go far away; the vehicles stopped in Ziugzda Street. The servicemen themselves did not give any guarantees about cancelling the attack on the Press Palace, therefore we urge the pickets outside the building to stay there for at least another hour.

We ask you to stand by for our further annoucements on the matter. We ask the pickets outside the Press Palace building to stay there for some time. Be disciplined and calm, don't give way to any provocations.

Program Warns of 'Provocators' Among Pickets

LD0804084790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0700 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Summary] The Sajudis Information Agency has issued a warning to the pickets outside the Press Palace in Vilnius, saying that there are provocators mingling in the crowd, and these people are carrying stones ready to smash windows and beat up soldiers. These provocators mainly speak Russian, the announcement says. Pickets are urged to isolate these provocators and deter them from sparking off riots.

The announcement also informs the pickets that military vehicles are moving towards the Press Palace with servicemen dressed in plain clothes. It is thought that they may mingle with the crowd and try to attempt a performance of attacking the Press Palace. The pickets are urged to move back from the building as far as possible, so that the planned attack on the Press Palace cannot take place.

The local FM radio station M1 is in operation in the building. It will inform the people outside if the situation changes. The station frequency is 73.34 mHz.

Picketers at Procuracy Send Protest to Gorbachev

LD0604230190 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 6 Apr 90

[excerpts] As we have already mentioned in our programs, one of the public buildings occupied by Soviet Army troops in Vilnius is the Lithuanian Procurator's Office. The building was seized by paratroopers a week ago, and soon after the takeover the USSR deputy procurator Vasilyev came from Moscow to Vilnius and brought along a puppet procurator for Lithuania, Antanas Petdrauskas, who had been working as a military procurator in the Baltic military district. The landing force from Moscow delcared that they were dismsising Arturas Paulauskas, who had just been appointed Lithuania's Procurator by the Lithuanian Parliament. Yesterday, a group of armed soldiers stopped Arturas Paulauskas and barred him entrance to the procurator's office.

The incident was shown on Lithuanian TV, and all the republic saw and heard the rudeness of the Moscow emissaries. They said openly that if anyone tried to enter the building without their special permission, he would be kicked out. The impudence of the invaders caused indignation of all the strata of Lithuania society, so today at lunchbreak a picket was held outside the procurator's office in Vilnius. A thousand or so people filled the street in front of the building, holding posters of support for Arturas Paulauskas and protesting against Moscow's self will. [passage omitted quoting slogans] Besides the public at large, taking part in the picket were also the professionals, members of the Lithuanian Law Society, judges, barristers, investigators, and prosecutors from various parts of Lithuania. The crowd met with unanimous approval the address of the Lithuanian lawyers to Mikhail Gorbachev and to all the lawyers of the Soviet Union. Procurators from various districts of Lithuania pledged allegiance to the Lithuanian Parliament and said they were resolved to abide only by the laws of the Republic of Lithuania. They called for support and unity of all lawyers of the republic, otherwise, they said, it will be hard to stand the pressure from outside.

It is worth noting that non-Lithuanians who spoke during the picket suggested bringing the Moscow emissaries to court for inciting ethnic discord, which is punishable according to their own constitution. [passage omitted]

Landsbergis Calls for Attendance at Vilnius Rally

LD0704154190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1200 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] As we have already reported, a rally in support of the decisions of the first session of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic of the first convocation will begin at Vingis Park in the republic's capital at 1600.

Esteemed listeners, in this connection, here is an appeal to you from Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian Republic.

[Landsbergis] We are hoping for the participation of all people of goodwill who support Lithuania's striving for self-determination and independence, which we have proclaimed as a recovered right but which still has to be implemented.

There will be guests at the rally. We are expecting them from Belorussia and the Ukraine and there may be some others as yet unknown who wish to support us and to speak, since we have seen many of these people arriving from the Union republics, including newly elected deputies from republican soviets and people's deputies of the Union.

We have also seen a small group of people's deputies, who have been engaging, it must regrettably be noted, in incitement. They have put forward slogans of opposition to the just strivings of Lithuania. This group obviously supports a program of preserving a unified state with all its conquered and seized territories, including those, too, that were seized by Stalin. They are acting in a very unseemly role, but this is their business.

However, I should like to set aside that issue. This is part of self-determination and a matter for the conscience of each citizen and potential citizen of Lithuania, how he views this land and its future.

There have been rallies in Lithuania that have been a response to the letter from Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR president. We want fine and good relations of cooperation. We do not want the relations of subordination and non-independence that we have had for almost half a century. Self-reliance, independence, and a democratic set-up within a state are a good thing for all citizens irrespective of their nationality. We are striving for this, and many citizens of non-Lithuanian nationality understand—or are beginning to understand the problem in this way—namely, that the fact that they have been intimidated or are still being intimidated is not the real problem.

Therefore, in speaking once again about the rally that will be held today in Vingis Park, I want to emphasize that since our entire path to independence has been approved by this rally and others and by other kinds of legislative measures, these things are not directed against anyone, either inside Lithuania or beyond its borders.

We know that we are helping democratic forces in Russia and the republics of the Soviet Union by our example and our experience. Perhaps we shall not completely succeed, but others will gain something useful for themselves from this. We are firmly confident that we shall not only defend Lithuania's right to be independent, but also help other peoples realize that this right is something absolutely indisputable. It may be suppressed but it cannot be destroyed. Nor may it be given away or graciously suppressed, because the right simply exists. It needs to be realized. One needs to live in accordance with this right and live according to truth and not to falsehood, since living according to truth is a blessing for everyone.

Vilnius Radio Carries 7 April Vilnius Rally

Landsbergis Speaks

LD0704133590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service at 1300 GMT on 7 April begins a live relay of a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius.

At 1300 GMT the announcer states that the microphones of Vilnius radio are in Vingis Park in the capital of Lithuania.

At 1302 GMT Lithuanian patriotic songs are sung.

At 1305 GMT chanting of slogans and applause is heard. "Lietuva" (Lithuania), is chanted.

At 1307 GMT an unidentified male speaker starts addressing those assembled in the park. He states that in this park the people of Lithuania gather in difficult times. Among those present is the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis. He is invited to the microphone.

At 1310 GMT Landsbergis starts addressing the gathering. He recalls the first meeting in this park when the Lithuanian tricolor was raised for the first time. There is a commotion and Landsbergis asks the audience not to pay attention to those who wish to disturb the meeting. He tells the audience that these people wish to see what is happening and they can see that not a few people, but a very large audience is assembled. The sound of a helicopter can be heard. Landsbergis tells the audience not to pay attention to the "dirt" being dropped from the helicopter. He says that they have been dirtying the world for the last 70 years and one can feel only pity for them.

At 1315 GMT chanting of the word "Lietuva" continues.

Landsbergis Continues

LD0704135490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1317 GMT on 7 April continues its live relay of a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius.

Landsbergis continues: "Our reply to all provocations is toil for Lithuania. At present Lithuania has not only its parliament, but also its government. They both work very hard, not all government officials could come to the rally because they are working. The center demands that the Supreme Council revoke its resolutions, and wants to pit independent Lithuania against dependent Lithuania. But the Lithuanians will never revoke their promise to be independent." Applause is heard.

At 1320 GMT Landsbergis quotes a saying by the Lithuanian great Duke Gediminas, who was also a king of many Russians. "We must live in the spirit of Gediminas, and not in the spirit of traitors and cowards. Shevardnadze said in Washington that the Army in Lithuania is only here to preserve law and order, but this Army is for the intimidation of people. The time will come when the Soviet Union will become a community of free nations and Lithuania will then be its friendly neighbor. Lithuania, a small country, has made its contribution to making the world better, and Lithuania is not alone. The world is changing and Lithuania is approaching a bright future, and those who are dirtying it now will go to the rubbish heap."

At 1327 GMT a male speaker appeals to the gathering to be dignified and calm, not to pay any attention to the helicopters or any other possible provocations.

At 1328 GMT Romas Gudaitis, deputy of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, is on the rostrum. He speaks in moving terms about the solidarity of the Lithuanians: "Our road is just and everyone should join to build a new Lithuania. The people's wisdom, assistance, and advice is essential for the deputies of the Supreme Council. The deputies will do everything in their power to aim for the negotiations with Moscow."

At 1333 GMT Prof. Smailys speaks. He says that at present Lithuania is a symbol of freedom and of the hopes of other peoples. She is like a Christ removing all oppressors. He says: "We can say today that we will never give up our ideals of freedom and independence. We are not afraid of those who drop leaflets on us." He concludes by chanting the word "victory." He welcomes the people's deputies from Moscow who are attending this rally.

Military Conscription Addressed

LD0704141390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1339 GMT on 7 April continues its live relay of a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius.

Mecys Laurinkus, deputy of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, speaks next. He says that the parliament and the government cannot immediately provide all guarantees to the population. "The problem of military conscription in Lithuania should be solved by political means. In this difficult situation, the support and determination of the whole population is essential. Military force can be very easily used against Lithuania, but because of this it is impossible to give up independence. Various means are being used against Lithuania's leaders, aimed at creating distrust among them, but political means must be found to solve all problems. It is impossible to give up everything that has been achieved so far."

At 1345 GMT a proposal is received to collect all the leaflets dropped and hand them in to the CPSU organization in Lithuania.

At 1347 GMT Deputy Justas Paleckis is at the rostrum. He says Lithuania has proclaimed independence and tanks and helicopters can do nothing about it. "Nobody will be able to erase Lithuania from the map of the world. The time has passed when strong leaders of this world could play with the fate of small nations. Lithuania wishes to have good relations with both East and West."

At 1353 GMT Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev, people's deputy of the Interregional Group, a guest from Moscow, states that he and his colleagues arrived here to offer their unconditional support to the 11 March act of Lithuania's independence. Some time will pass, but this date will mean an end to the last empire in the world—the Russian empire. "At present Moscow still stubbornly adheres to the old emperial traditions, but the progressive forces in Russian will ever more support Lithuania's freedom because it also means the freedom of Russia." There is tempestous applause and chanting.

Gorbachev Appeal Read

LD0704143590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 7 April continues its live relay of a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius.

Secondary school pupil, Gabriele Peremonova, reads in Lithuanian her message in verse to Gorbachev, asking him not to frighten Lithuania with tanks and planes, but to recognize its independence.

At 1403 GMT Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene is at the rostrum. She says her government will implement all Lithuania's laws in spite of great difficulties in the dialogue with Moscow, which must end in negotiations. "Although Moscow says that it will never recognize Lithuania, contacts with various departments already exist. The Supreme Council and the Lithuanian government need all support and unity of the population."

At 1408 GMT the chairman of the Vilnius branch of the Polish Union, Jerzy Surwillo, shames the Soviet Union for using force in Lithuania. "We do not need helicopters and tanks, we need negotiations. Long live independent Lithuania."

At 1413 GMT Academician Buracas says that at one time hecicopters used to fly over Reaichstag in Berlin, but this did not prevent the collapse of the Berlin Wall. "The strengthening of the occupation regime with tanks and army will not help. Lithuania will never return to socialist paradise. Lithuania was included into the Soviet prison by force and it does not owe anything to the Soviet Union." He thanks in Russian the people's deputies for attending this rally. Buracas condemns the Soviet Union and its Army for making use of its strength to support the occupation regime.

At 1420 GMT a male speaker states that the rally is attended by some 300,000 people.

Latvian Deputy Speaks

LD0704152590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1421 GMT on 7 April continues its live relay of a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius.

A greeting from Prague is read in Russian, stating that last week a demonstration took place in support of Lithuania.

At 1422 GMT Romas Razukas from Latvia speaks next. He says that Latvia has not yet proclaimed its independence, but the same methods are being used against it—helicopters fly there, too. Independent democratic Latvia must be restored, too. He wishes success to Lithuania. He addresses all Latvians taking part in the rally in Latvian, expressing his hope that soon Lithuania would be welcoming and supporting independent Latvia.

At 1427 GMT Juskevicius, whose title is indistinct, thanks all Lithuanian people for electing suitable representatives to the Supreme Council. Juskevicius criticizes remarks made by Gorbachev in his message and condemns him for sending troops and tanks to Lithuania. He also criticizes him for wanting to revise Lithuania's borders.

At 1437 GMT a representative of the Union of Free Lithuanian Farmers greets the rally. On behalf of his union he supports the Lithuanian parliament and government.

At 1441 GMT a representative of the Ukrainian Rukh, whose name is indistinct, speaks in Ukrainian, supporting Lithuania's case and appealing to non-Lithuanian residents here to do the same.

At 1445 GMT a greeting from a Ukrainian organization, whose name is indistinct, is read.

At 1451 GMT a male speaker reads the results of a questionaire held at the rally. To the question of support for the proclamation of independence 98 percent are for, 1.5 percent are against the proclamation. To the question of whether or not the Supreme Council works well, 80 percent reply that it works well, 10 percent say satisfactorily, 9 percent say it works poorly.

To the question of support for Gorbachev's message, 1.1 percent support the message, 87 percent do not support it. When asked who is responsible for the fact that negotiations with Moscow are not taking place, eight percent blame the Lithuanian Supreme Council, 85 percent blame the Soviet Government, and 5.5 percent blame both.

At 1458 GMT a representative of the Belorussian National Front is at the rostrum.

Appeal To Yazov Read

LD0704155990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1506 GMT on 7 April continues its live relay of a rally in Vingis Park in Vilnius.

(Grigoriy Isas), a representative of the Jewish community, states that there is no way back for Lithuania, and asks God to defend Lithuania and all nations represented here.

At 1510 GMT an appeal is made to people to take a more active part in local elections.

At 1511 GMT Valdas Petrausskas speaks on behalf of the Lithuanian Democratic Party. In his opinion independence was not proclaimed too early. "It is going to stay forever. The demonstration of Soviet military power will not intimidate the people of Lithuania." He urges Lithuanian youths not to respond to the call to serve in the Soviet Army.

At 1516 GMT Romualdas Ozolas speaks on behalf of the Lithuanian government, reading a draft message to the USSR Defense Minister Yazov, protesting against provocative military acts in Lithuania. The message is approved with applause.

At 1520 GMT a speaker whose name is indistinct reads a poem devoted to Lithuania's independence and appeals to all governments of the world and all politicians to support Lithuania. There is chanting of "Lietuva." A patriotic song is sung.

At 1530 GMT Landsbergis concludes the rally, asking people "Do we really know what we want?", "Are we not going to give up our aim?" The rally responds with chanting. He asks again: "Are we going to survive persecutions and provocation?" The rally responds with "Yes".

At 1533 GMT a male speaker reads a resolution of the rally.

At 1536 GMT the resolution is approved by applause and shouts of approval.

At 1537 GMT the rally ends. The Lithuanian state anthem is played.

Landsbergis Addresses 7 April Vilnius Rally

LD0704204290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1310 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Speech by Vytautas Landsbergis, president of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, at Vingis Park rally in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Demands currently are being made for us to revoke the Supreme Council resolutions, so that independent Lithuania would become dependent Lithuania again. Yesterday, a proposal made to us was carried by IZVESTIYA, urging us to renounce our principles, whereas today, you can read here the words imprinted upon our hearts and which already have been handed down to us for 600, almost 700 years, and which I can recall for you: Iron first will melt into wax, and water first will turn to stone before we will renounce our word. [passage omitted]

However, we hope that sufficiently healthy forces, democratic and freedom forces exist there, which will change that land so it too will become a community of free countries, with which we will maintain the same friendly relations we now maintain with emmissaries who come here from Belorussia, the Ukraine, Russia, and Moscow, the newly elected soviet deputies of which support us with united resolution and resolve. There is the future of the world...[interrupted by applause] There is the future of the world, where people speak out for democracy and freedom as being of more value than useful trade or other agreements. [passage omitted]

Pro-Independence Vilnius Rally Described

LD0704230790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Excerpts] A mass rally was held in Vilnius today in support of Lithuania's independence and by way of answering Mikhail Gorbachev's address to the people of Lithuania a week ago. Some 300,000 people who had come from all over Lithuania took part in the rally which was held in Vingis Park, the traditional site for Lithuanian song festivals and, in the last two years, all sorts of mass demonstrations. [passage omitted]

The rally started at four p.m. and lasted some two hours and a half. [passage omitted]

At the very beginning of the rally, when Chairman of the Lithuanian parliament Vytautas Landsbergis was addressing the crowd, a military helicopter stated circling low above the field making a nasty loud noise and spilling leaflets from its fat metal belly. The leaflets carried quotations from President Gorbachev's address to the people of Lithuania, but there were also others showing base charicatures of the Lithuanian leadership.

The noise of the helicopter was so big that the people got lost for a moment, yet Vytautas Landsbergis soon had all the crowd in a cheerful mood: Let us not pay attention to them. They also are furious to see what is going on here. As for the littering, they have been spreading litter in the whole world for 70 years already. the best answer to all their provocations is our work for the sake of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis said, adding that there will come a time when common sense will win and when threats will be replaced by dignified dialogue. [passage omitted]

There were quite a few (?of) speakers and their speeches were rather emotional. Professor [name indistinct] Smailys from Kaunas pointed out that Lithuania has become the symbol of freedom for all the nations that are still enslaved. Like Jesus Christ, Lithuania has resurrected on the eve of Easter and has shaken off all her oppressors, said Professor Smailys, followed by the chanting of the word victoria by the multi-thousand crowd.

Referring to President Gorbachev's demands to repeal the decisions adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Council on 11th March, Vytautas Landsbergis quoted what the great [name indistinct] said to the Teutonic Kni;ghts in early 15th century: Iron must first melt into wax, and water must first turn into stone before we retreat.

The Lithuanians received quite a number of honorable guests from the Soviet Union who had come to express their solidarity with the Lithuanian nation. Among the guests were a few people's deputies of the USSR from the progressive Inter-regional Deputy Group.

Professor Yuriy Afanasyev declared to those gathered in Vingis Park in Vilnius that by its 11th March act of the restoration of independence, Lithuania had torn up the shameful Hitler-Stalin deal of 1939, the aim of which was to enslave Lithuania and other Baltic nations. The time will come, Professor Yuriy Afanasyev said, when all the people would realize that 11th March is the beginning of the end of the empire. He regretted that Moscow was still clinging to the imperial thinking, and his speech was met with a long ovation.

The Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimieras Prunskiene focused on the possibilities of dialogue with Moscow, and she said that Lithuania was ready to sit at the negotiations table, but she feared much effort would be still needed to find Moscow sitting at the other side of the table.

Secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Justas Paleckis noted that big powers can no longer play with the fates of small nations. The determination of the Lithuanian nation, he said, cannot be crushed by tanks or military helicopters, and there is no way of blocking out Lithuania from the map of the world now.

One of the Sajudis leaders, Academician (?Antonas) Buracas referred to Mikhail Gorbachev's address to Lithuania and pointed out it was unrealistic to aspire after the Nobel Prize and rattle the weapons in Lithuania at the same time. It is not dignified either for a Helsinki Act signatory to speak of border changes, Academician Buracas said. [passage omitted: representatives of Belorussian and Ukrainian Popular Fronts welcomed Lithuania's resolve; spoke of their aspirations for freedom]

The participants of the rally in Vilnius adopted a resolution saying that a majority of people in Lithuania consider the rights of a nation's self-determination to be the precondition for democratization in the USSR and Lithuania. The people of Lithuania fully support the 11th March act of independence and expressed the hope that the call of the Lithuanian people for talks on the basis of equality will be received by the Soviet leadership as an initial step of people's diplomacy, as an act of paving the way to friendly relations between the Republic of Lithuania and the peoples of the USSR.

After singing the national anthem, the 300,000-strong crowd peacefully left Vingis Park and went to their homes.

Further on Vilnius Rally

LD0704220190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] We are all concerned with what is happening in Lithuania today and what the atmosphere is like there. Our special correspondents are reporting on how things are going on in the republic this Saturday.

[Aleksandr Barkhatov, identified by screen caption] It has been announced in Vilnius that Sajudis will hold a city rally today. Many people are arriving from other towns and rayons of the republic. We are now at the square near a railway station from where people are heading toward the rally. But the streets in Vilnius have begun to look transformed in the two hours before the rally [video shows rally, slogans in English and in Russian: "Red Army get out!" Another in Russian: "Independence"] The essence of exclamations and signs express support for the policy of the republic's Supreme Soviet, which, as everyone knows, has already adopted dozens decisions and laws contradicting the USSR Constitution. Sometimes it seems that the republic's Supreme Soviet is fully identified with the Sajudis movement. Although the slogans proclaim pluralism, it [pluralism] has perhaps one peculiarity—sharp utterances addressed at the country's leadership, and at the Army, which has incidentally been today the only opponent of people in the streets, not in the form of cordons or reinforced detachments. The Army's loudspeakers relayed an address, the sense of which amounted to one thing, perhaps: The independence of one people cannot be built at the expense of infringing upon the rights of others, whoever they are. [video shows crowds shouting and applauding a speaker, and then another part of the crowd, in front of which is Landsbergis with flowers, standing silently and gloomly] [passage omitted]

[Video shows rally, helicopter flying over dropping leaflets] There was another attempt to get across a different viewpoint on the events in the republic—when people got together at the rally at the Vingis Park. Perhaps it is worthwhile reading out an extract at least from a leaflet that has fallen near us: The situation in and around the republic has become critical. One-sided actions and ultimatums of the Lithuanian leadership are jeopardizing the peaceful life and security of the whole people of the republic—both Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians.

The next thing it says is that the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet are hasty, as the process of radical transformation of the Soviet Federation on a democratic basis has already begun.

[Announcer] I would like to add regarding the rally in Vilnius that about 300,000 people took part in it. Those speaking at the rally were Landsbergis, Prunskiene, and others of the republic's Supreme Soviet, and representatives of democratic movements of the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Latvia. The participants of the rally adopted an address to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the USSR president.

Text of Message to Yazov

LD0704163590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1516 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Message to USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov read out at Vingis Park rally in Vilnius by Romualdas Ozolas—live]

[Text] To USSR Minister of Defense Dmitriy Yazov:

Three hundred thousand representatives and guests of Lithuania who gathered in Vilnius' Vingis Park to approve the 11 March resolutions by the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, lodge a strong protest against the provocative overflights by military helicopters, which endanger human life. We regard this as one of the acts of terror against Lithuania and demand that the culprits be punished.

Resolution Approved

LD0704164790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1533 GMT7 Apr 90

[Resolution approved at Vingis Park rally in Vilnius—live; read by unidentified speaker]

[Text] We residents of free Lithuania, having gathered in Vilnius on 7 April, state:

1. The people of Lithuania, since the beginning of perestroyka, have been ardently supporting its idea, linking with it hopes of democratization and freedom.

2. The majority of the inhabitants of Lithuania regard the implementation of the principle of free self-determination of nations as necessary for the expansion of democratization in the USSR and Lithuania and completely support the 11 March 1990 resolution by the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania to restore Lithuania's statehood.

3. The independence of the republic of Lithuania was restored in a peaceful constitutional manner by a freely and democratcially elected parliament, adopting such decision by an absolute majority vote, the legality of which is not disputed, but supported by a great majority of Lithuania's inhabitants.

4. The people of Lithuania are convinced that any attempt to deny the legality of the decisions adopted by the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, as well as efforts to destabilize the situation in Lithuania have no legal grounds and inflict great harm on the normal internal life of our country and on the relations among the nations living on our soil.

5. The hostile actions towards Lithuania applied lately by the USSR Government provoke our concern and indignation, destroy our confidence in the goodwill of the USSR Government, and compel us to doubt the sincerity of perestroyka that you have announced.

6. We ask you to do everything possible so that equal negotiations start as soon as possible between the republic of Lithuania and the USSR, based on the spirit of mutual understanding, respect, and goodwill, in order to solve all disputed questions between the two parties.

7. We express our hope that this message of ours will be understood as the first step of popular diplomacy, paving the way towards friendly relations between the republic of Lithuania and the peoples of the USSR.

This is the opinion of 300,000 Lithuanian inhabitants.

Afanasyev Speaks at Vilnius Press Palace Rally

LD0804181990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1145 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Report by Deputy Vladimir Yermolenko of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania from the Vilnius radio studio—live]

[Excerpt] In our studio is Vladimir Yermolenko, a deputy in the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania. You have just come from the Press Palace. You probably have quite up-to-date information.

[Yermolenko] Good day, esteemed listeners! In fact, that's not quite right. I haven't come from the Press Palace, but from the republic's Supreme Council. It is true that this morning I visited the Press Palace with USSR People's Deputies Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev and Arkadiy Nikolayevich Murashev. Well, I should tell you that our guests from Moscow were pleasantly surprised at the self-possession, resilience, organization, and discipline of the people gathered there. They knew what had been going on at the Press Palace, and they knew that pickets had congregated there. But, they were quite amazed to find that the vehicles parked there with soldiers were surrounded by people standing peaceably, having taken up positions, well, some distance from the vehicles. Arkadiy Nikolayevich said he would very much like the same thing in Moscow.

They wanted very much to talk to the soldiers. They were wearing black berets. You know, they too remarked on the discipline of the people who had gathered there, and one of them in a truck said to me: We can see that this is

Lithuania, not Baku! I would be very happy if these soldiers draw the necessary conclusions. Yes, indeed: This is Lithuania.

Afanasyev spoke through a megaphone, as he had to. Many deputies spoke: Deputy Bickauskas, Deputy Butkevicius, Professor Buracas. We tried to find out who was in charge of the troops, but the colonels and lieutenant colonels sat in their jeeps and refused to come and see us. Yuriy Nikolayevich addressed the people with many fine words. And after the military left, the people greeted the USSR deputies. There were, indeed, very many warm words spoken. Yuriy Nikolayevich was presented with a flag of the Republic of Lithuania, the coat of arms, and had a sort of folk kerchief tied around his neck. The warmth of the welcome in that tense situation made a great impression on the visitors, I believe. They said later: But that was an unplanned rally! Yesterday's was planned, but today's was just a picket, mounted on the initiative of Lithuanian citizens.

Then, we arrived, albeit very late, at the republic's Supreme Council, where the meeting began—or rather continued—among the USSR people's deputies and Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, and Yevgeniy Petrov, member of the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. Members of a standing committee, Virgilijus Cepaitis, Emanuelis Zingeris, (?and several deputies) were also present.

During this meeting we spoke about the situation in the republic; about what is going on in the country; and about how deputies from the Interregional Group, from the Moscow Soviet, and from many other regions of the country, from [word indistinct] to Leningrad, are reacting to this. [passage omitted]

TASS Reports on Vilnius Rally, Resolution

LD0704181690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1729 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, 7 Apr (TASS)—Aleksandr Budris, TASS special correspondent, reports:

A 300,000-strong rally in support of the Lithuanian parliament's decision on restoring the statehood of this Baltic republic was held in Vilnius today. At the call of the "Sajudis" Lithuanian movement, columns of people from all parts of the town converged on the Pevcheskoye Field at the "Vingis" town park. Representatives of the People's Fronts from Latvia, Estonia, Belorussia, Azerbaijan, and the "Rukh" Ukrainian movement attended the rally, too.

Participants in the rally adopted an address to Mikhail Gorbachev, USSR president. The document contains a request to do everything possible to start talks which would make it possible to solve, on the basis of equality, mutual respect, and amicability, all the vexed questions that arise.

Vilnius Correspondent on Response to Strike Call

LD0604214890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Report from Vilnius by Correspondent A. Barkhatov, identified by caption; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Barkhatov] The answer to the appeal of the USSR president, which was adopted yesterday evening by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic, has not yet been published. Therefore, only the deputies who voted for the document were prepared to comment on it. The text of the reply to the appeal by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will be published tomorrow in Lithuania's newspapers.

Warning strikes were held at several enterprises in Vilnius this morning. Right now we are outside the Elfa production association. [video shows a meeting being addressed by a speaker, whose remarks, away from the microphone, are mostly indistinct. correspondent holds microphone for individual members of the audience]

[First worker] This meeting is being held to express support for the appeal and decrees of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, as president. Our workers, 80 percent of whom are not Lithuanian speakers, consider that the Soviet Constitution should operate here, on the premises of the factory.

[Second worker] They cannot work. They cannot work. You yourself understand. The political situation is such that people cannot work.

[Third worker] We don't have a trade union. It is paralyzed.

[Fourth worker] In the United States for example, in the States, Bush would come and talk to people—in short, make contact. Gorbachev would do the same. Why doesn't Landsbergis come to No. 1 or No. 2 factory to talk to people, if he wants to calm them down. There is unrest the whole time now. It is difficult to understand why he doesn't come, because the unrest started precisely because of his policy.

[Barkhatov] In fact, only a small part of the work force took part in the strike.

[Fifth worker] We should work, not hold meetings.

[Barkhatov] Is that what you think?

[Fifth worker] Yes

[Barkhatov] Although some workshops were empty, the assembly line was running normally. Clearly, quite a few people here have lost their appetite for the very acute forms of political struggle, which used to be popular here, even though the slogans themselves are unquestionably supported.

[Barkhatov addressing man sitting at a workbench] Excuse me, why are you not on strike today?

[Worker] I am at work now. [words indistinct]

[Barkhatov] The complex political situation cannot fail to effect the management of the republic's economy and its strategy as a whole. There are many questions that have continued to preoccupy people, and not just in Lithuania. Furthermore, as you know, the composition of the Republic's government has changed considerably over these last few days. A new member of the republic's Council of Ministers is Rimvydas Yasinavichyus, the minister of industry.

[Yasinavichyus] We in Lithuania, including industrialists and practical economists, are quite normal people. Just for the sake of ambitions or ideological disagreements we do want to intend, ever, to sever good, friendly, economically beneficial and effective ties. On the contrary, we want to continue all this. Very unfortunately, many enterprises are beginning to claim that Lithuania is doing something wrong politically and because of this they are severing a whole number of well-estabished links involving the supply of raw materials, components, and even entire machines.

Lithuania Receives Ryzhkov Message

LD0604223290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] [Announcer] According to information given to me by Vice Premier Romualdas Ozolas, a reply was received this evening from the USSR premier. He states that all the acts adopted by Lithuania's highest authorities and government can not become the object of negotiations between Vilnius and Moscow.

The leader of the USSR Government, of course, does not recognize the Lithuanian Council of Ministers resolution not to draft young men for military service. He declares that the USSR law regarding young men's April draft is in effect in all USSR republics, including the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic.

A telegram has already been drafted and will be sent to Moscow in answer to Nikolay Ryzhkov. Its basic premise, according to Romualdas Ozolas, is as follows: The two sides' differing positions, with one based upon the USSR Constitution and the other on the Lithuanian Republic constitution, do not hinder constructive decisions and negotiations between the two sides.

Lithuanians Warned To Comply With Call-Up

LD0604183690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Vilnius, 6 Apr—A TASS special correspondent reports:

The military registration and enlistment offices of the republic are ready to commence in an organized manner, Major General A. Visotskis, military commissar of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic, stressed at a meeting with journalists at the interdepartment press center. The press conference was devoted to the spring call-up to the USSR Armed Forces, which is now beginning.

The bulk of Lithuanian young men wish to fulfil their constitutional duty, the republic's military commissar noted. The parents of those being called up are applying to us, and who firmly declare that their sons will become soldiers. Those young men who refuse to turn up in accordance with the call-up notice will be called to account. The most strict measures will be taken against persons who harass those being called-up or their parents, or who call for a boycott of military service.

It is known that the republic Supreme Soviet, in a decision of 14 March 1990, ended the activity of the Military Commissariats of the USSR Ministry of Defense which are located on the territory of Lithuania. Under an instruction of the republic's Council of Ministers, city and rayon executive committees have been charged with not participating in the 1990 call-up to the Soviet Army, to end economic services to Commissariats, and financing connected with this, while sending the staff who are thereby released to bodies of local self-government. How will the work of Military Commissariats take place under the situation which has formed?

Major General A. Visotskis replied to this question by a TASS correspondent, that the aforementioned decision is illegal and demonstrates the incompetence of the republic Supreme Soviet. After all, Military Commissariats do more than decide matters connected with the call-up. The range of their duties is much broader. It includes awarding pensions and benefits to servicemen and their families, resolving matters to do with treatment at health resorts, and examining complaints and letters. As the commissar stressed, the military registration and enlistment offices are working as normal, and are receiving dozens of people daily.

Lithuania Halts Military Conscription Activities

LD0704091790 Vilnius Domestic in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Taking into consideration the fact that the USSR Government ignores proposals by the government of the republic of Lithuania, that problems concerning the defense interests of the Soviet Union and of the republic of Lithuania should be solved by way of agreements, the republican Council of Ministers has passed a decree which instructs the republic's enterprises, offices, organizations, and executive committees to stop operations concerning military conscription, engage those released from these operations in other work, and not to supply Military Commissariats with the lists of youths of conscription age or with other information.

Town and rayon executive committees are instructed not to supply Military Commissariats with premises as of 30

April of this year, if by that date problems concerning military service are not solved by agreements.

Defense Ministry Statement on 'Anti-Army Campaign'

LD0704172990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1536 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—Separatist forces in Lithuania are proceeding along the path of escalating an anti-Army campaign, according to a statement by the USSR Ministry of Defense press center which has been published here today. In addition to the irresponsible and illegal decisions adopted earlier by the present Lithuanian leadership, it notes, new ones are appearing, which are deepening the dramatic nature of the situation in the republic. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has adopted an appeal to youth in connection with the USSR Government's decision on the spring call- up. It is difficult to call this appeal anything other than inflammatory. By provoking young people to refuse service, that is, to commit a crime, it also contains instructions on how to do this. Is it forgiveable to play with people's fates so lightly by adopting hurried, illegal decisions?

And how can one evaluate the actions of those "Sajudis" functionaries who, with the aim of counteracting the call-up, are planning the urgent transfer of students at correspondence and evening faculties of Lithuanian higher educational establishments to day departments? The only answer is that a worthy model of immorality is being demonstrated in this manner to youth.

In Lithuania, increasing pressure is being brought to bear on members of servicemen's families, especially in the towns of Kaunas, Klaipeda, Siauliai, and Panevezys. Instances are occurring of their being denied medical care or employment.

In the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the Duma of the NFL [Latvian People's Front] has adopted an appeal to conscripts, promising help and protection to those who "refuse." In this connection, the Procuracy of the Republic has issued an official warning and described the actions of the NFL as provocative and unconstitutional. Anti-Army agitation is being carried out by the nationalist organizations "Geneva-49" and "Fiery Cross." Speaking in schools and technical colleges and at meetings, their representatives are intimidating the conscripts and their parents with various fabrications about military service. In Riga, Cesis, Dabele, and other population centers, there have been attempts to intimidate and blackmail staff members of military commissariats.

Similar actions are being perpetrated by separatist forces in Estonia, where the forming of Kaitseliit (Defense Union) detachments is being stepped up. On 5 April the republican newspaper "MOLODEZH ESTONII" [Youth of Estonia] published a report that a "frontline squad" of the Kaisellit was about to be set up in Kohtla-Jerve and Rakvere rayons of the Estonian SSR. Such actions cannot fail to arouse great alarm and concern. It is the duty of all right-minded people to be firm in resisting the separatists, the report of the USSR Defense Ministry stresses.

General Condemns Landsbergis Anti-Draft Address

LD0704180690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1111 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Mikhail Zakharchuk reports:

The "Address by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic to Lithuania's Young People," signed by Vytautas Landsbergis, has been published in Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. It calls on Lithuanian citizens to universally refuse to serve in the Army. At the TASS correspondent's request, Lt.-Gen. Ivan Matveyev, head of the Directorate [not further specified] of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, comments on this "address."

"All sorts of laws, appeals, and addresses are being published in Lithuania now with some bewildering, and I would say, suspicious haste. This is yet another document, which cannot but cause astonishment.

"I will begin by saying that the Congress of USSR People's Deputies declared invalid the decisions adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian SSR, which contradict the USSR Constitution and USSR laws. In relation to this, all those citizens of the Lithuanian SSR who would suddenly respond to Landsbergis' call and would fail to come to the enlistment offices, would undoubtedly find themselves in conflict with the USSR legislation. The consequences of such a conflict could be costly to Lithuania's young people. Landsbergis is very well aware of that but, nevertheless, he incites his young compatriots to commit illegal acts. 'Although Lithuania's authorities'—the 'Address' reads,—'are powerless to protect young people from compulsory recruiting, they, however, undertake legal and moral responsibility for the refusal of citizens of their state to serve foreigners.'

"Let us leave to the conscience of the authors of this instigatory document the specific terminology where, for instance, an honorable duty of every USSR citizen is called 'recruiting,'" General Ivan Matveyev continued. "Let us think about another thing. Why do Landsbergis and his supporters need such an irresponsible—it is hard to qualify it any differently—statement? Why are they drawing young people into their dubious political intrigues? And what sort of statesmen are they if they allow themselves, with such an enviable nonchalance, to play with the lives of their compatriots? It is clear to every sensible person that nothing but political intrigue is behind all those lofty and florid utterances.

"In conclusion, I would like to express the confidence that Lithuania's young people themselves will grasp the essence of the ongoing events and will not allow anyone to play with their lives so arbitrarily and irresponsibly. I have no doubts, either, that the conscientious Lithuanian youth will not violate Soviet legislation and will properly fulfill their constitutional duty."

Airborne Troop Commander Interview in Baltics

LD0604211290 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—Members of practically all nationalites of the country serve in Soviet airborne troops, most of them are Russians. The ration corresponds to the ethnic composition of the Soviet Union, Colonel General Valdislav Achalov, commander of airborne troops, told IZVESTIYA.

"At present airborne troops are a complex military mechanism that includes highly mobile forces, and units stationed in various regions of the country," he said in an interview published in IZVESTIYA on Friday on the occasion of the 60th jubilee of these troops.

In a telephone interview from the Baltic area he pointed out that complex political processes that affect basic vital interests of the population are taking place in the region.

"The paratroop regiment which is now in Vilnius was sent to the military township on the outskirts of the city with the sole purpose—to prevent ultra-extremist manifestations," Achalov said.

"The regiment personnel had to help the military prosecutor's office in the search and apprehension of deserters, to place in safe custody arms and ammunition handed in by the organisations and the population, to withdraw them from those who did not obey the presidential decree, and to ensure the guarding of important economic facilities.

"Our servicemen are also patrolling the republic's areas bordering on Belarussia, Latvia, andd the Kaliningrad region of the Russian Federation to prevent breaches of law and order," Achalov said.

Commander Describes Paratroop Role in Lithuania

PM0804150590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Telephone interview with Colonel General V. Achalov, commander of Airborne Troops, by correspondent V. Litovkin; date and place of interview not specified; under the "Details for IZVESTIYA" rubric: "Airborne Troops Do Not Choose Their Fate"; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] A news conference devoted to the preparations for the 60th anniversary of the airborne troops was announced for 6 April in Moscow. It was planned that it would be conducted by Colonel General V. Achalov, commander of the Airborne Troops. But the conference did not take place since the commander was unable to attend—he is on an official tour of duty in the Baltic. Our correspondent telephoned him.

[Litovkin] Vladislav Alekseyevich, I saw how your guys operated in Afghanistan and the Transcaucasus. What are they now doing in Lithuania?

[Achalov] The airborne troops do not choose their fate. We have been to Afghanistan, Sumgait, Yerevan, and Baku. We were the first to help the earthquake victims in Leninakan and Spitak. Today people are talking about the Baltic. Although all these events are of, course, quite different.

[Litovkin] Yes, but airborne troops have never before entered a republic's capital and guarded administrative buildings?

[Achalov] The paratroop regiment which is now in Vilnius is a totally different link in this chain. It was indeed brought into the military cantonment on the outskirts of the republic's capital, by night moreover, in order not to disrupt the habitual tenor of life in the city for one reason—to prevent excessive extremist manifestations (this possibility cannot be ruled out). We came to help the military prosecutor's office in investigating and arresting deserters—there were around 400 of them—receive weapons and munitions from organizations and the population, confiscate them from those people who failed to obey the president's decree, and guard facilities of great national economic significance.

[Litovkin] Including the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee building?

[Achalov] Yes, like some other buildings, it was built with CPSU funds and, naturally, could not be handed over—as some republic leaders were trying to do—to other public organizations. It is now being guarded by a USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] subunit and we have left it.

Our men are also patrolling areas of the republic that border on Belorussia, Latvia, and Kaliningrad Oblast today in order to prevent breaches of law and order.

[Litovkin] Nevertheless the preparations for the troops' jubilee were the reason for our telephone call. Their history is well-known. Many books and articles have been written and movies made about the airborne troops... But few people know the real nature of your troops today...

[Achalov] The airborne troops today are a complex fighting machine which incorporates highly-mobile formations and units stationed in various regions of the country. They are armed with modern armored equipment and weapons. Namely marked two airborne combat vehicles, self-propelled artillery systems, and mobile antiaircraft missile complexes. During an airborne operation, we use a large arsenal of multiple-chute and retrorocket systems. We have more than 100 military specialisms within our troops. It is particularly remarkable that there is not a single soldier or officer who would not carry out parachute jumps when fulfilling a training or combat mission.

[Litovkin] What is the ethnic and social composition of your troops?

[Achalov] Officers, ensigns, sergeants, and enlisted men of virtually all nationalities serve with us. At present there are 47 nationalities. Most are Russians. Then come Ukrainians, Belorussians, Tatars, and Moldavians. There are also Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Azerbaijanis, Armenians, and Georgians. The proportions are in line with the ethnic composition of the Union. People have at least a secondary or specialist and technical education. Some 93 percent of officers have a higher education. Their average age is 31-34.

'Soyuz' Members Warn of Escalating Tension

LD0604174690 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

To introduce presidential rule in Lithuania is the only way out of the crisis situation that has taken shape, according to representatives of the deputies' group Soyuz who visited the republic this week.

The Soyuz, a group of USSR people's deputies, which was formed in autumn last year, proclaimed it as the main programmatic goal to retain the unity of the USSR.

The deputies who visited Lithuania are Yevgeniy Kogan (Estonia), Viktor Alksnis (Latvia), Nikolay Petrushenko (Kazakhstan) and other active figures of the group. All deputies were unanimous in the evaluation of the situation in the republic: In their judgement, the situation has become aggravated to the utmost and is threatening to develop into a direct confrontation.

In the opinion of representatives of the Soyuz, such steps by Sajudis [Lithuanian Movement for Restructuring] as a boycott of the draft into the Soviet armed forces are deliberate moves towards escalation of tension.

The emissaries of the group Soyuz had many meetings with Russian- speaking population of the republic, who, according to the deputies, with one accord favour the introduction of presidential rule in the republic.

In answer to journalists' questions as to what measures presidential rule should envisage, Kogan emphasised that, to begin with, the now existing structures of power in the republic should be dissolved, law enforcement agencies should be reinforced and possibilities for a free expression of all points of view in the mass media should be created.

Following that, the representatives of the group Soyuz said, it is necessary to hold a referendum in accordance with the law, adopted by the Soviet Parliament this week, on a procedure for the union republic's secession from the USSR.

Such a referendum should involve all citizens who permanently reside on the republic's territory. Not less than two-thirds of their votes are necessary for the adoption of a decision to secede.

If such a decision is taken, a transitional period of not less than five years shall be established. Territorial, property and financial issues with the USSR and individual republics should be settled within the period.

'Soyuz' Deputies Call for Presidential Rule

LD0704004990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] (Yevgeniy Kiselev) Maybe you remember, comrades, that the Soyuz group of deputies in the Supreme Soviet has undertaken to defend the rights of Soviet citizens in Lithuania. In furtherance of this mission, members of the group have been to the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. This evening they invited journalists to attend a news conference [video shows men seated at a table in front of journalists]:

[Correspondent L. Khatayevich, identified by screen caption] One of the first questions to be asked by the journalists concerned the official status of the delegation.

[Unidentified deputy] The group of deputies was paying a private visit. We did not have any [word indistinct] official tasks or instructions from the Supreme Soviet. It was an initiative taken by the Soyuz group of deputies itself.

[Second unidentified deputy] ...in response to a telegram.

[First unidentified deputy] Furthermore, we received the appeal from the Committee of Soviet Citizens in Lithuania. [video shows man holding up a telegram]

[Khatayevich] Many of the things said by Deputies Shuvalov, Alksnis, Kogan, Tikhonov, Kim, Petrushenko, and other participants in the trip are already well known to viewers. The Vremya program has given quite detailed coverage to their work in the republic. Nevertheless, you cannot help making a new and more precise assessment of the facts when you talk to eyewitnesses and familiarize yourself with the documents. These papers include summonses to the procuratorate. Hundreds of them are currently being sent to inhabitants of Lithuania who do not agree with the decisions made by the republic's Supreme Soviet.

Here is another fact which is less well-known to the residents: All the savings banks have been instructed not to accept funds collected by members of the Lithuanian Communist Party that accepts the CPSU Platform. The first document shows that they are trying to intimidate those who disagree. The second shows they are trying, by all means possible, to prevent the consolidation of those forces which might resist the official policy of confrontation.

The deputies acquainted the journalists with numerous letters and appeals from Soviet citizens who have already found themselves in a calamitous situation. The letters demand from the Supreme Soviet, the government, and the country's president specific measures to help restore the democracy which has been trampled underfoot in the republic. What do the organizers of the news conference see as the solution to the sitution?

[Unidentified correspondent] Do you or do you not see ways of reducing the confrontation and achieving a constitutional solution of the problem?

[First unidentified deputy] I, personally, and the majority—the deputies in the group that traveled to Lithuania—think there is only one course to be taken: the imposition of direct presidential rule in Lithuania.

Minorities' Rights in Lithuania Said Violated

PM0704140590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Apr 90 Second Edition p 1

[N. Garifullina article: "Only A Referendum"]

[Text] Sharing the alarm of the newly-formed Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania, the "Soyuz" group of deputies has stated its intention to represent and uphold their interests in the USSR Supreme Soviet and other supreme organs of power. The Committee of USSR Citizens in Lithuania has confirmed these powers. Owing to numerous appeals, letters, and cables from working people and the committee itself, USSR People's Deputies S.G. Shuvalov, G.I. Tikhonov, Ye.V. Kogan, V.I. Alksnis, Ye.U. Kim, V.V. Khmura, N.S. Petrushenko, and N.A. Kostishin toured Lithuania for two days, met with labor collectives, attended rallies, received citizens, and talked with various categories of residents. A press conference yesterday for the capital's journalists in which V.A. Bakurin, second secretary of Shyaulyay Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) Gorkom [city party committee], took part in addition to the aforementioned people's deputies was devoted to the results of the trip.

Numerous facts and documents were cited at the press conference which convincingly attest to most flagrant violations of ethnic minorities' civil rights and tremendous psychological pressure. Democracy and glasnost are being violated and pluralism is one-sided: Even USSR people's deputies were denied their request to speak on Lithuanian Television. The decisions of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the instructions given by the USSR president and the Soviet Government are not being fulfilled.

The people's deputies asked journalists to publicize the demands made by thousands of people at rallies and voiced in hundreds of collective letters and appeals for direct presidential rule to be established in Lithuania and the question of its secession from the USSR to be resolved solely by means of a national referendum. People are increasingly beginning to think about where Sajudis is pushing them. The prestige of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU Platform) is growing.

'Unsteady Balance' Prevailing in Lithuania

LD0604201890 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 6 Apr 90

[By TASS Special Correspondent Nikolay Zheleznov and Petr Cheremushkin]

[Text] Vilnius April 6 TASS—The situation that formed in Lithuania after the unilateral proclamation of independence by the Republican Supreme Soviet and the address of the Soviet president, that followed it, can only be described as unsteady balance. Various sections of the population, which is alarmed by the tension, regard these developments in diametrically opposing ways.

These attitudes manifest themselves in the rallies continuing in various districts of Vilnius and in other cities. They differ not only by the colours of flags, but also by entirely different intentions, which are incompatible so far. Activists from the Soviet Citizens' Committee in Lithuania urge the new Lithuanian Parliament to display common sense. They believe that the hasty secession from the Soviet Union will wreak havoc in the republican economy and create enormous difficulties for non-Lithuanians, who make up 20 per cent of the population. However, Sajudis leaders are adamant. Their goal is independence at all costs.

The tactics of Sajudis, which has a majority at the Republic Supreme Soviet, became especially evident during the discussion of a draft response to the address of the Soviet president. Its editing lasted for four days and ended on Thursday by midnight.

However, it was clear even from the first version that the new Lithuanian Parliament does not recognise the president's demand and, consequently, regards as legal all the laws it adopted and all its actions. All the four readings were actually confined to finding the form of addressing the president, most suitable for the present tense situation.

Moreover, along with the discussion of various versions of the response another matter was discussed at one of the sessions—the giving of identification certificates of Lithuanian citizens to draftees, which could protect them against the "spring call-up to the Army of another state."

As a result of all this any unbiased lawyer, who can disregard the high-flown style of the document, will be able to see only one central idea in it. Unfortunately, there is nothing new in it. The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet "reiterates its readiness to begin a dialogue and discuss measures to establish new relations between our two states."

Many of those with whom we spoke in Vilnius regard the response as the continuation of the irresponsible actions, which created tension in the republic after March 11. On the other hand, many people are sure that this carefully worded answer of the Supreme Soviet is the only possible way out in the present situation.

This is why passions are running high by both sides. Labour collectives of nine Vilnius industrial enterprises held a warning strike on Friday morning to support the address of the Soviet president.

According to P. Navikas, head of the industrial department of the business management of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers, some 2,000 people took part in it.

Sajudis plans to hold a reply meeting on Saturday in support for actions of the Republican Supreme Soviet. A massive rally was also held on Friday in the Salcinskiy region of Lithuania with predominantly Polish population. The main questions raised at the meeting were the same: When will accord come to Lithuania? When will common sense get the upper hand ahead of crucial choice to be made?

Internal Troops Reinforced at Procuracy Building

LD0704083290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Excerpt] Lithuanian Internal Affairs Minister Marijonas Misiukonis has informed that the building of the Lithuanian Procuracy has been occupied by USSR Internal Troops. They are following instructions from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs issued after the USSR General Procurator's request to secure the work of the procurator appointed by Moscow. Internal troops guards were already in place at the Lithuanian Procuracy, but yesterday they received reinforcements. About 20 people dressed in militia uniforms and armed with automatic weapons, pistols, and rubber sticks arrived there. It was not clear yesterday whether they were internal troops or paratroopers. This was established today.

At a meeting of the Lithuanian procuracy collegium, Lithuanian Procurator Arturas Paulauskas acquainted officials with a decision by the Lithuanian Supreme Court plenum to maintain relations only with the Lithuanian Procuracy and examine cases submitted only by the Lithuanian Procuracy. Other republican institutes for the protection of law and order, the Ministries of Internal Affairs and of Justice and the state arbitrator are recognizing only the Lithuanian procuracy. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian Deputy Describes Yakovlev Meeting

LD0704222890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1805 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "View" program, presented by Vladislav Listyev and Aleksandr Lyubimov]

[Text] [Lyubimov] Vladik, what is Vilnius saying?

[Listyev, holding telephone] Consultations began on 3 April between representatives of the Lithuanian parliament and the center. I know that there was a meeting with Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev. On the line now is Romas Gudaitis, one of those deputies. He is a deputy and writer, and secretary of the Lithuanian Union of Writers. He took part in this meeting. Romas, the viewers are listening to us. What happened at the meeting? How did it pass off? What matters were discussed?

[Gudaitis via telephone] I must say that a commentary in PRAVDA described the (?range) [words indistinct] dealt with at the meeting. It was indeed a very frank and principled meeting, very necessary and useful. But let me reply to the first question. (?The interview) with Aleksandr Nikolayevich [words indistinct] and I must say that we did not seek to interpret somehow the discussion and the meeting in our own fashion. We did not say anywhere that this was the start, the actual start of negotiations. We three deputies came on a goodwill mission, and the discussion somehow coincided with our intentions. We were not an official delegation.

The interest that the meeting aroused in Lithuania and the Lithuanian media is natural. It is natural because everyone in our Republic—and I hope in other republics throughout the Soviet Union and throughout the world too—is awaiting the start of [words indistinct]. So many different commentaries and different reactions have appeared in the press. But to return to the commentary in PRAVDA I am a little suspicious about the questions that were put to Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev. And the impression one gets is that even a hint of such a preliminary dialogue—it is not yet a dialogue, it is just a sort of preliminary [words indistinct] does not suit certain people.

[Listyev] Thank you very much. Let's hope this dialogue does take place and that this dialogue is developed. Thank you very much, Romas Gudaitis.

[Gudaitis] Thank you very much.

TASS Views Importance of Lithuanian 'Problem'

LD0604174790 Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 6 Apr 90

[By TASS commentator Aleksandr Mineev]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The Lithuanian crisis was among the most important problems of world politics this week. It was disussed at meetings of politicians from various countries and became the subject of statements made by heads of government and legislators.

The problem is so important in the context of international relations because of the geographical position of Lithuania in the renewing Europe and because many Western countries did not recognise the integration of Baltic republics in the Soviet Union.

Although it was proclaimed in the Soviet Constitution that Union republics can secede from the USSR, nothing like this happened in the 70 years of the existence of the Soviet Union. This was made possible only by the development of perestroyka, and it became clear that during seven decades (or five decades in the case of the Baltic republics) the destinies of Union republics became so closely intertwined, that it is impossible to break the ties between them right away without damaging each other.

New democratic authorities of the USSR began to draw up a set of laws aimed at the renewal of the Soviet Federation, including a mechanism of the constitutional secession from it.

The present crisis around the situation in Lithuania was brought about neither by the movement of the Lithuanian people towards independence, nor by Moscow's desire to stop it, but by the way chosen by heads of the Lithuanian parliament.

One can hardly win the respect and confidence of others, by the hasty proclamation of Lithuania's independence by its Parliament, organised at night, on the eve of the Congress of People's Deputies. One can hardly expect any kind feelings from others, if he writes the name of his country on posters with the symbols of Nazi SS troops in the middle and tramples down the country's emblem. One can hardly hope to establish normal relations with the Army if it is stubbornly called "occupation force."

Confrontation is the enemy of democracy. It is always directed against both sides. The demonstrative violation of the Constitution does not promote the settlement of the problem. The result is the opposite. Armoured vehicles in the streets or military helicopters over the parliaments will not bring closer the solution of the problem either.

The artificial assumption that Lithuania was never part of the Soviet Union, chosen by Vilnius as a legal basis for a dialogue with Moscow, is groundless from the point of view of international law. There are two possible explanations of the persistency with which the Lithuanian leadership is clinging to it: Either it does not wish to take the risk of a referendum, which is included in the constitutional secession procedure, or it seeks to settle in its favour all property matters.

Although it is this assumption that blocked the way to the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state, there is another thing which is of no less importance. One should recall the wisdom of Heraclitus, a philosopher from ancient Greece, who said that one cannot enter twice one and the same river. We cannot return to the Europe of the 20s and the 40s, to the system of international relations that existed in the first half of the current century.

We would not like to question the sincerity of Vytautas Landsbergis, when he says that he does not want to harm perestroyka by his actions. However, his words sound very much like wishful thinking. At the time which is crucial for perestroyka any backheel can lead to grave consequences, which was clearly pointed out in President Gorbachev's address to the Lithuanian people.

It is not accidental that Western countries are in no hurry to make any commitments to Vilnius. First, from the legal point of view only a legally capable state can be recognised as independent. Second, which is even more important, too much is at stake. The world is changing for the better. It is more interdependent than ever before. There will be no free and democratic Lithuania in a world thrown several decades back.

Brazauskas Interviewed in Hospital

LD0604203290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 6 Apr 90

["Traditional Friday interview" with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party, by Benas Rupeika; date and place not specified—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Rupeika] You talked just now on the telephone with the minister of industry?

[Brazauskas] Yes, I was asking how the collectives at the enterprises react to the provocation to stop work and organize strikes. I asked him to watch and calculate how much such actions, where people think that political matters can be solved by such methods, cost the enterprises. I do not understand the actions of the CPSU organization's in Lithuania. Both in the Soviet Union and in Lithuania all parties are equal, and I think that the very fact that the directors have been invited and warned to organize this strike does not fit anywhere. Such matters cannot even be considered in a normal way. [passage omitted] I think that the collectives will understand that this is a senseless step. Political matters and problems must be solved by political methods, and not by economic and compulsory means. [passage omitted]

This method of creating unpleasantness and opposition, and then drawing conclusions about the situation in Lithuania is a dirty game, a dishonorable game. We have enough problems, they are now not only our problems, they are the problems of Moscow and of Vilnius; they are becoming world problems. [passage omitted]

When false information is spread in the Soviet Union, this makes the possibilities of talking seriously and in a constructive manner with the heads of individual departments in the Soviet Union, and even at the highest level, more difficult. [passage omitted]

I know people in Moscow who have an impression that life in Lithuania is very unstable and difficult, especially for non-Lithuanians residing in Lithuania. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] I think that Moscow's propaganda machine works in a quiet way and endeavors to see the objective side of the events taking place in Lithuania. Maybe this is the result of the visit by Shevardnadze to Washington? Or, maybe that other states see us already as a partner?

[Brazauskas] I do not think that this is the result of Shevardnadze's visit. On the contrary, I think that Shevardnadze's visit to the United States was prepared in order to treat the events in Lithuania and the relations of Lithuania with the Soviet Union this way. But time is a great healer, and these first impressions of 11 March and the decisions of our Supreme Council, the assessment of these events, I think, has become more tolerant. But of course, to put it mildly, the majority of these decisions do not make easier or bring closer our negotiations with the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

One should also mention events in Estonia. [passage omitted] This is connected with many of our basic decisions and makes our lot easier. I think that world public opinion and statements by the leaders of other states and their urging to solve these very complex problems by way of negotiations have had a great influence. I think that our leadership should very resolutely approach Mikhail Gorbachev with concrete proposals for negotiations. [passage omitted]

[Rupeika] I apologize for my distrubing you while you are in the hospital [not further explained]; but would you have enough strength to take part in consultations, and later, in negotiations? With all your influence and knowledge of the situation in Moscow, would you, if this were offered to you?

[Brazauskas] I am prepared. My illness is not serious. I think I will be fit next week and will work normally. I am prepared to take part in negotiations. [passage omitted]

I have written a letter to Mikhail Gorbachev, as general secretary, concerning the decisions on the division of property or—more precisely, nondivision—contending that it belongs to the CPSU. Lithuania's communists in the seventies amassed, by various means, over R300 million. I think that this is not a small sum for such a comparatively small party organization. I think that we have not only a moral, but also a legal basis to claim a large part of this property. We have at present 86,000 party members. [passage omitted] There is moral right to this property. Now it has been officially proclaimed, and a policy is being carried out that we have nothing and cannot have any claim. All this belongs to somebody else. This is even greater inequality than in the economy. I think that this usurpation of property provokes the feeling of injustice among people, among the communists.

[Rupeika] Surely you will not dare to step over this party barrier by taking the initiative in cooperation with Moscow?

[Brazauskas] All this must be done on the scale of the state, and in a solid manner. I think that if each of us will start looking for justice in his own way, or organize negotiations, nothing will come of it. A delegation must be confirmed, at the highest level, in our republic. Its composition will be decided. I am always willing to take part. In view of my acquaintances during those decades, and in the present situation, I could play no small part in these negotiations.

[Rupeika] I will ask you, as they sometimes like to ask in parliament, directly and, maybe naively: Do you believe in real independence for Lithuania?

[Brazauskas] Yes, I do. I always believed in it. But assessing the situation of the union, I think that it is a very complex matter. Many efforts, cunning, diplomacy, and politics will be required to gain this independence. This cannot be a onesided act. All actions carried out by us must be simultaneously carried out in Moscow. [passage omitted] I would like to wish to all, and to those who are taking an active part in our political life, to have the feeling of reality. Sometimes this reality is being disregarded. [passage omitted] Further steps in negotiations must be different, as is stated by foreign leaders and diplomats. [passage omitted]

Brazauskas on Lithuanian Reply to Gorbachev

LD0604232690 Vilnius International Service in English 2200 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] A number of the Supreme Council decisions passed after 11 March are by no means conducive to bringing forward our talks with the Soviet Union. This must be acknowledged, and I cannot say otherwise. This is what Lithuania's vice premier, Algirdas Brazauskas, said today in an interview for the Lithuanian Radio. He qualified the reply to President Mikhail Gorbachev's message to Lithuania's Supreme Council, adopted yesterday, as a serious diplomatic document openly calling for dialogue, for consultation, which ought to pave the way for negotiation. In the opinion of Algirdas Brazauskas, if such an appeal had been adopted on 11 March we would have won three weeks. Algirdas Brazauskas said that Lithuania's Council of Ministers had considered a whole package of draft agreements to be offered to the Soviet Union's leadership. An important place in the talks will be taken by economic issues and settling accounts with the Soviet Union. Algirdas Brazauskas said the claim for 18 billion rubles that Lithuania allegedly owed the Soviet Union did not convince him. In his opinion the figure was very much exaggerated. Lithuania's vice premier also said he was ready if necessary to take part in consultations and talks with Moscow.

Council Halts Supplies, Finances to Commissariats

LD0704191390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] The Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers has adopted an instruction to halt supplies to; and the financing of Military Commissariats by the republic's town and rayon executive committees.

Papers Appearing Regularly, Overflights Continue

LD0704113890 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Excerpts] Next in our program is the weekly "Press Digest." Before we start we want to reassure our listeners that all newspapers are coming out regularly in Lithuania, although following the attempts to seize the printing house and to ban the printing of the most progressive papers, people used to ask anxiously at the news stands whether the dailies had been sent in. All the militarized seize and ban actions in Lithuania are conducted by the so-called collaborationists, members of the Soviet Union's Communist Party organization in Lithuania, assisted by their friends from Moscow. [passage omitted]

We see warplanes over our heads in Lithuania every day and we have even got used to that. These flights, however, make up only the demonstrational part of the program, which by no means discloses the occupationists' strategy. The military are in a hurry to set up another department of theirs in Lithuania. This is reported by the daily LIETUVOS RYTAS. The Soviet Union's Civil Aviation Ministry and high-ranking military authorities are reported to have ordered the leadership of the Lithuanian civil aviation to allot premises and to let the military use the radar and communications equipment. The uninvited guests are already in Vilnius and have occupied one of the airport's relaxation rooms, which is now guarded by soldiers with Kalashnikov submachine guns. This stepping up of their military department means that we'll in future have not only more military helicopters circling over our heads but also more servicemen's families arriving in Vilnius.

Lithuania Message to Georgia Marks Anniversary

LD0804141390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The Presidium [of the Lithuanian Supreme Council] sent a telegram to the Supreme Soviet of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic on the occasion of the anniversary of bloody events in Tbilisi. As is known, on the night of April of last year, units of the USSR Armed Forces massacred the participants of a peaceful demonstration in the capital of Georgia.

Commemorating the anniversary of the death of innocent victims in Tbilisi, the telegram reads, we are together with the Georgian nation.

Late that night the Presidium of the Supreme Council of Lithuania also adopted an appeal to the servicemen of the USSR military units deployed in Lithuania.

Klaipeda Rally Expresses Alarm Over Future

LD0804215890 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] Thousands of people have taken part in a rally in the Lithuanian port city of Klaipeda, sponsored by the Committee of Soviet Citizens Residing in Lithuania. Speakers pointed to growing ethnic tension and spoke of alarm about the near future. They said the unilateral proclamation of Lithuanian independence had jeopardized hundreds of thousands of people, and they also called for a balanced and objective discussion of the problems the republic is facing.

Russian Lithuanians Interviewed on Independence

LD0704184190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1805 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Unidentified correspondent's report from the "View" program, presented by Vladislav Listyev and Aleksandr Lyubimov]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] These episodes of city life were filmed for you in Vilnius and Kaunas by our cameraman, Vladimir Avdeyev, during precisely those days when a war of nerves was flaring up between the capitals of Lithuania and the USSR. [passage ommitted]

One should note that a guaranteed majority of the republic's residents regard Lithuania's secession from the USSR as the primary task, and support the unanimous decision to this effect taken by the deputies of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. If we want to deal with realities, this one is not negligible. [video shows street scenes]

It is a fact that the Russian-speaking minority in the republic is not homogeneous, and the feeling of protest can hardly describe in full the range of emotions experienced by our compatriots. Here, for example, is an evening meeting of the Russian Cultural Center in Lithuania movement. (Artem Inozemtsev), peoples artist of the republic and actor of the Vilnius Russian Theater, is chairman of the Russian Cultural Center:

[(Inozemtsev]) The republic of Lithuania has become an independent and sovereign state. We, representatives of the Russian Cultural Center, welcome and support this. We want to share the fate of the Lithuanian people. This is the main thought that, perhaps, we should voice today. All the rest is details. [video shows (Inozemtsev) talking to correspondent]

[Correspondent] Meanwhile, rally-style democracy is flourishing in Lithuania, mainly in Vilnius. Servicemen of the garrison are taking part in political life, too, lifting their voices literally to the skies. [video shows helicopter over flying town, dropping leaflets; close-up of leaflet headed: "Vilnius residents! Electors!"]

Here is a recording of a rally at a Union-subordinated enterprise. It was organized by the Communist Party on the CPSU platform.

[Unidentified rally speaker] This coup has been accomplished by a group of people for whom a minority of the eligible republican residents has voted. The majority of the elected deputies received about 35 to 40 percent of votes. [video shows rally in enterprise yard]

[Correspondent] Other small and large-scale rallies are being held, too. Lithuania has deep-rooted traditions in this area. Here, incidentally, are several photographs that already have become part of history. That visit, when sides yet used to listen to each other's arguments, is very memorable for Lithuania. [video shows several photographs, one featuring Gorbachev and Brazauskas, others showing pro-Lithuanian rallies]

But what now, completely apart? Regimantas, how do you feel in this situation?

[Regimantas Adomaytis, actor and USSR people's deputy] How do I feel? All right. I welcome all the decisions that have been made here. That was natural, and everything was moving toward it; it is a natural step. Of course, everything is yet to be solved at the negotiating table.

[Correspondent] The independence of Lithuania as a state is often equated with cutting off links with, say, the rest of the USSR. You obviously have sound artistic links. Do you think they will break?

[Adomaytis] No way! Kirill Lavrov [USSR people's deputy and chairman of the board of the USSR Union of Theater Workers] asked me at the congress: What is going to happen now to the Russian Drama Theater in Vilnius? Nothing will happen; it will remain the same. Everything will be natural and normal, and there must be a Russian Drama Theater in Vilnius. [video shows Adomaytis interviewed, Prunskiene and Landsbergis exchanging words in a corridor of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, worker removing the word "Soviet" from the inscription "Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic" on the building of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet]

[Correspondent] Regimantas Adomaytis' opinion seems typical. At least, I have not heard from a single Lithuanian that the links that have established themselves in culture or the economy should be broken off. Yuozas Urbshis, who enjoys prestige in the republic, is in favor of good relations, too. He can hardly be suspected of a pro-Moscow stand. This 94-year-old man, who has never been member of any party, was the foreign minister in the last government of independent Lithuania. His diplomatic career ended in an 11-year-long solitary confinement in a Soviet prison, a labor camp, and exile. Now Yuozas Urbshis calls on the Lithuanian authorities to be cautious and not to take rash steps. In 1939-40, he had a chance to meet Stalin and to hold talks with Molotov. On 30 October 1939, Yuozas Urbshis signed a treaty with the USSR on transferring the town of Vilno and Vilno Oblast to the Lithuanian Republic and on mutual assistance between the USSR and Lithuania. That treaty recognized Lithuania's independent statehood, and he refers to that in our conversation:

[Urbshis] In my view, one should return to the 1939 treaty, take it as the basis for talks, and on the basis of this treaty, give the role of an independent state back to Lithuania, such an independent state as would maintain friendly relations with the Soviet Union, and especially with the Soviet people. [video shows Urbshis in his study, various archive photographs and documents] [passage omitted]

Correspondent Rounds Up Events in Lithuania

LD0704170190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Special Correspondent Gennadiy Kolenov report from Lithuania]

[Text] Today is Saturday, a nonworking day. The deputies of the Republic's Supreme Soviet have dispersed for meetings with the voters, but the white heat and throb of political life in the republic is not abating. I have in front of me now today's issue of the newspaper EKHO LITVY. It publishes the appeal of the republic's Supreme Soviet to our country's president, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We believe, it says, that you, esteemed president, would prefer a political settlement of the problem to any other. At the same time, the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Republic once again confirms its willingness to begin a dialogue and discuss measures for establishing new state relations between us.

Here, too, together with the law of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the procedure for solving questions connected with the secession of a Union republic from the Union, are published four laws of the Lithuanian Republic. One of them deals with the certification of citizenship of the Lithuanian Republic. It states that while passports are being prepared, a citizen of the Lithuanian Republic receives a certification and signs the following undertaking: I, the undersigned, having received such a certification of citizenship of Lithuania, undertake to observe the laws of the Lithuanian Republic and to respect the independence of my state and its territorial integrity.

This means to observe the laws that have already been passed by the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania. This document is arousing various reactions on the part of those who disagree with Lithuania's decisions on secession from the Union, among others. What will happen to them if they do not sign the undertaking? They will be outside the law and will not receive passports. These two documents have been signed by Vytautas Landsbergis, president of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, and in my view, they clearly contradict each other.

Of course, many people are worried about the question of holding a referendum in the event of secession from the Union, as provided for by the country's law on the procedure for solving questions connected with the secession of a Union republic from the USSR. Landsbergis has expressed the opinion that the existing mood is in favor of discussing with the Soviet Union the question of holding a referendum in Lithuania, and also any other question except that of annulling the independence act promulgated by Lithuania's Supreme Soviet.

Regarding today's events, let me say that the Sajudis is to hold a meeting in Vingis Park in Vilnius this evening, the aim of which is to support the decisions of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. Tomorrow, there will be a meeting in Klaipeda, as well, but in support of the decisions of the Congress of People's Deputies and of the appeal by the president of our country to the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Lithuanian people. That meeting will be held by the Unity Movement.

Commentator Views Situation in Lithuania

LD0704163990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1805 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "View" program, presented by Vladislav Listyev and Aleksandr Lyubimov, with guest commentator Dmitriy Kiselev]

[Text] [Listyev] Today experts on inter-ethnic relations are refusing to comment on what is happening in Lithuania, because events are changing very rapidly and it is difficult to keep track of them. But as journalists, we have a duty to inform. Our guest is Dmitriy Kiselev, a commentator at the main news editorial office—you will know him from Seven Days. He spent a week in Lithuania following the well-known decision of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. Let's get straight down to the issues. It's said that 35-40 percent of the inhabitants of Lithuania voted for the present deputies of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet.

[Kiselev] You're worried by this figure, and indeed everyone immediately regards this as a minority. This 35-40 percent is indeed a minority of those entitled to vote, but it is a majority of those who turned out to vote. By way of comparison, we could recall 1984, when ust 30 percent of those entitled to vote supported Ronald Regan at the presidential elections, but this was a majority of those who voted. No one has since cast any doubt on the authority of the U.S. President. The results of thse parliamentary elections do not of course necessarily have to force the minority to agree to the adopted decisions, and, as we can see, the minority does not agree. It has the right to express its viewpoint at the meetings, for example, which we see every day on television.

[Listyev] Yes, but [words indistinct) in the all-union news media they have a near-monopoly on this right. But perhaps a referendum should be held after all, although my question no doubt represents interference in Lithuania's internal affairs.

[Kiselev] Well, let's simply inform. At any rate, the idea of a referendum, which was voiced for the first time in Moscow, as it happens, is gaining support at present, it seems to me. And, as far as I know, in Lithuania the Lithuanian leadership is inclining toward this idea, and only the formula for this referendum is being discussed at the moment. As we know from reports on sessions of the Supreme Soviet, Moscow is proposing the formula that two-thirds of Lithuanians will have to back secession, and then the decision will be considered adopted. On the other hand, international custom supports a simple majority decision.

[Listyev] We shall keep viewers informed. But still, there are the interests of the minority, who belong to other language groups. Every day in the media we hear that their interests are being infringed.

[Kiselev] This is indeed a painful problem—that's how it seemed when I was in Lithuania. And the position of the Russophone population—or the minority population belonging to other language groups, in general—is rather difficult in this situation. But what can one do here? This could obviously be a separate point at the discussions that are starting between the capitals of Lithuania and the Soviet Union. But at the same time, even today, if the news media, particularly the al-union ones, refrained from setting at odds the Russophone population, or the population belonging to other language groups, on the one hand, and the majoraity, on the other, in such a direct way, this would no doubt ease the situation. Otherwise the Russophone minority will be put in an even worse position.

[Listyev] I can see Vladik has got through to Vilnius. Just one more question very briefly. Whose is Vilnius?

[Kiselev] Well, as I understand it, this is a territorial dispute, references to which came out in the debate at the Congress of People's Deputies. But I personally find it hard to believe that the Soviet Union will now support and initiate a redrawing of European borders. This could set off a chain reaction in the form of discussions about Silesia, East Prussia, Bessarabia, Karelia, and the Western Ukraine. I don't know who would gailn from this.

[Listyev] Let us hope that, via negotiations, or to use a more innocuous term, consultations—great significance is currently being attached to this—the situation will ease.

[Kiselev] At any rate, in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's well- known messages, a fairly mild tone can be detected.

[Listyev] Talks are always the best approach.

Belorussian People's Front Chairman Interviewed

LD0704174990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] [Announcer] In the Lithuanian Supreme Council today, representatives of Sajudis and members of the parliamentary floor group have been holding a meeting with representatives from the Belorussian People's Front. There are six people in the delegation, which is headed by Zenon Poznyak, chairman of the Belorussian People's Front. Tell me please, what is the purpose of your visit?

[Poznyak] First and foremost, to register our support for Lithuanian independence. That is, to voice our opinion and express our moral support for our neighbors. Particularly since the latest political events—the pressure brought to bear on Lithuania from Moscow and especially the pressure brought to bear on Moscow by the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the BeSSR [Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic]—compel us to find paths for our relationship and for discussion of the issues that Belorussia and Lithuania have in common. Because we believe that Lithuanian independence is our common concern. The future of other republics rests on this. In this instance, Lithuania is out in front—a pioneer. And pioneers attract all the brickbats. So, that is our aim. This is an unofficial meeting, though it is true that we received a telegram from the parliamentary floor group—from esteemed Cepaitis—inviting our delegation to the meeting today, and of course so that we might exchange opinions on common issues.

[Announcer] Tell me, please, how was the statement by the Presidium of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet received in Belorussia? The one which spoke of territorial claims on Lithuania.

[Poznyak] It came as quite a shock to Belorussian society, because throughout the past 50 years, the government of Belorussia had never raised the matter. As likely as not, this was not even so much that it did not want it raised, as that it always consistently acted on Moscow's instructions. The Belorussian government never had an opinion of its own on this matter. The fact that this statement has come now, of all times, testifies to the fact that it has not appeared independently. This is Moscow's policy, and this is quite clearly so. It is intended in some way to create a seat of tension, and perhaps provide an excuse to send in troops. In other words, it is a well-drilled imperial policy which will always find its puppets, and so on. Naturally enough, we do not feel that in this instance the opinion of the communist government of Belorussia is its own, personal opinion—a sincerely held opinion. Therefore, the Belorussian People's Front has made its attitude towards this statement clear in its own statement of 3 April this year. It views the statement as one not been issued independently, and as a brand of political blackmail.

We believe that, in the first place, given the political situation, now is not the time to go issuing territorial demands. And in any case, they should not be couched in this fashion! For whether under the BeSSR Constitution, or in line with the Helsinki agreement, all territorial matters are sorted out by talks and agreements between the parties concerned. In this case, no talks have been held in the past 50 years, and even in the run-up to this statement, so far as I know, neither the government of the Belorussian SSR nor of Lithuania had any such talks. In other words, this statement came as a bolt from the blue, and was presumably intended to be perceived in a way that would lead to tension. And for this reason we deplore it.

We realize perfectly well that a problem does actually exist, since there is a Belorussian-speaking population here, and the area does have its problems, and so on. But all of this can be resolved through democratic means, by both republics pursuing mutual policies, by creating the preconditions and so on. That is what should be undertaken, not political swashbuckling! The days of our Supreme Soviet Presidium are numbered. It is the old Presidium, and it will bequeath lots of unresolved problems and a series of political mistakes. So that is the situation today.

[Announcer] As the spokesman for Belorussia and for the Belorussian People's Front, what would you like to say to the many Belorussians who live in Lithuania?

[Poznyak] I should say that those Belorussians who live in Lithuania must, above all, be ruled by common sense. They must not yield to any political pressure, either from Moscow or from other political forces, and must not embark on any cavalier escapades. I believe that the Belorussians have a fairly highly developed common sense, and I would think that the people will find the correct way to behave in this situation. And of course, I should like to take this opportunity to pass on my very best wishes for health, prosperity, and cultural outlook.

Estonian Supreme Soviet Declaration on Congress

LD0604210590 Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 31 Mar 90 p 1

[Text] Declaration of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet on Cooperation Between the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Estonian Congress

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet recognizes the Estonian Congress as being the representative body of the citizenry of the Republic of Estonia and as being the restorer of the state power of the Republic of Estonia.

The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet is ready for cooperation with both the Estonian Congress and the Estonian Committee in order to restore the Republic of Estonia on the basis of legal continuity.

[Signed] A. Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet
[Dated] Tallinn, 30 March 1990

City Council Claims Estonian Resolution Invalid

LD0604223990 Moscow TASS in English 2228 GMT 6 Apr 90

[By TASS Correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn April 7 TASS—Narva became the third city in the north-east of Estonia where a session of the City Council declared invalid the resolution of the Estonian Supreme Soviet "on the status of Estonia". Several days before similar resolutions were adopted in the cities of Sillamae and Kohtla-Jarve, which are also located in a zone of a compact settlement of non-Estonian population.

Deputies of local Soviets of these three major industrial centres regard as unconstitutional the resolution adopted by the Estonian Supreme Soviet, because it does not recognise the legality of Soviet power since its establishment in Estonia and supports the idea about changing the republic's state system.

Latvian Communist Party Splits; Leader Elected

LD0804091390 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] The 25th Congress of the CP [Communist Party] of Latvia, which society had awaited with great interest if only to see and hear how splitting of the CP would occur, continued in Riga for two days. You already heard from the relay of the work of the congress and from journalists' interviews during the breaks that the congress could not end with consolidation.

The so-called conservative or Interfrontist part of communists, which predominated at the congress, has not come closer even by a hair's breadth to that truth which is sacred, with which the Latvian people have lived and breathed entirely recently: it is freedom, the state independence of Latvia. It is a pity, but those communists—aliens—still think according to old dictate categories, and are not capable of respecting the rights of other peoples.

The solution at the congress followed at that moment when the conservatively-minded, again with considerable help from Alfreds Rubiks as head of the editorial commission—and this being confirmed also by Boris Pugo—did not accept as a basis even the documents drawn up by the Central Committee, which the adherents of the independent CP were willing to support on the whole, making of course some essential corrections.

As a result, these supporters of the Independent CP of Latvia, a total number os 261 persons, left the hall. And after a considerable spell of embarrassment and consultations both factions gathered in separate halls of the House of Political Education and continued work. We relayed this, too. The adherents of the Independent CP decided to convene for their congress on 14 April, as it had been envisaged earlier. With this the work at this congress was concluded.

On the other hand, the Communists on the CPSU platform continued work for considerably longer, examining the adopted agenda of the congress.

It must also be said that during this period the adherents of the CPSU platform did not really understand the sadness of what had happened, because they continued to fight, whilst adopting documents, for various old dogmas.

After that the congress continued work behind closed doors. We shall report about the elections results when we receive information from the Latvian Telegraph Agency, but according to unofficial information Alfred Rubiks has been elected first secretary of the Central Committee.

Riga Radio Carries 6 Apr Latvian CP Congress

Editorial Commission Established

LD0604110490

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0700 GMT on 6 April begins to carry a live relay of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga. Correspondents Peteris Tabuns and Alfreds Leiterts interject comments throughout the proceedings.

Janis Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, opens the congress. He states that 799 delegates were elected to the congress and 791 of them are participating. A vote counting commission is approved. Vagris mentions that Boris Pugo is participating in the work of the congress today.

Three versions of the working presidium are proposed. While waiting for the votes to be counted on the agenda, correspondent Tabuns notes that LATINFORM regained its old name—the Latvian Telegraph Agency, LETA—a couple of days ago. The first version is voted for by 266, 490 for the second, and 30 for the third. The second version is adopted. The election of the secretariat follows:

At 0718 GMT a mandate commission is elected.

At 0719 GMT a delegate from Liepaja, speaking in Russian, has a proposal which Vagris hands over to the mandate commission.

At 0723 GMT discussion on an editorial commission begins. There is no point in including Comrade Peters, it is noted, because he is on a working mission abroad. There are several other proposals, among them a Latvian proposal, instead of Peters', to elect Rozenvalds. (Vagris yesterday proposed not to include Gorbunovs). More proposals and discussion on the electoral commission follow.

At 0744 GMT an editorial commission is approved by a large majority, and the proposal to replace Peters by Rozenvalds is rejected. While the vote counting is in progress correspondent Tabuns remarks that there is already confrontation, though good natured, in these discussions.

At 0750 GMT more proposals on the editorial commission are considered.

At 0756 GMT Klaucens, speaking in Russian, voices his support for Gorbunovs. An Ogre delegate objects to the number exceeding 37. Vagris suggests 40 members for the commission.

At 0759 GMT Bresis asks for a vote on him personally.

At 0800 GMT Gorbunovs asks to be removed as a candidate, because in connection with his proposed Lugano trip, he will not be present tomorrow afternoon.

At 0803 GMT a vote is taken for Krustins (editor of LAUKU AVIZE), who was proposed earlier as a candidate as there are no members of the intelligentsia on the commission.

At 0805 GMT Vagris asks whether they should continue beyond the number of 40, and a delegate from Daugavpils proposes that Gorbunovs should remain on the commission all the same. At 0809 GMT this is approved by a vote; at 0811 GMT Bresis is also approved; and with 42 members the commission is complete.

At 0812 GMT the agenda and procedures are discussed.

At 0813 GMT a proposal is made by Krumins, in the name of Kirova Rayon, to include historial assessment of Communist Party activity. Discussion on this is postponed.

At 0815 GMT the proposed agenda is approved.

At 0817 GMT a vote is taken on Krumins' proposal and it is rejected. Correspondent Leiterts comments on the provocative contribution made by Klaucens concerning Gorbunovs.

At 0820 GMT there is a proposal on the year 1959. Vagris disagrees with its inclusion.

At 0823 GMT Kezbers says he thinks the historical aspects are very important and proposes a compromise. The essentials should be published by tomorrow.

At 0825 GMT a vote is taken on the historical question.

At 0830 GMT it is proposed that a commission be set up to address historical questions.

At 0831 GMT Vagris suggests that they conclude discussion on the agenda.

At 0833 GMT a proposal to restart the publication RIGAS BALSS this evening is made. There is a lot of discussion on this. Vagris does not think that this concerns the congress, but others disagree.

At 0839 GMT it is suggested that Kezbers immediately report on this, but Vagris thinks that by the end of the congress will suffice.

At 0840 GMT Kezbers, speaking in Russian, suggests that the ownership of the newspaper should be decided by law. Heated discussion follows.

At 0848 GMT it is rejected by a vote to include the issue of RIGAS BALSS on the agenda.

At 0850 GMT a half an hour break is announced.

Party Restructuring Viewed

LD0604113990

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Lativan at 0920 GMT on 6 April continues its live relay of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

After some procedural discussions, Vagris begins his report at 0927 GMT. Then there is a question on translation. He restarts at 0930 GMT.

Vagris notes that this congress is of an extraordinary nature. The questions of independence of sovereignty are prominent. The draft program and rules have been published. Party restructuring is lagging behind.

The Central Committee has been the prime mover in connection with the langauge problem. But later, the party allowed other public and political organizations to assume a principal role.

The question is how to regain leadership, for the party to establish contact with the masses. But there are some who still think that the party should be the judge on everything.

At present the Latvia Communist Party is experiencing one of its most difficult tests in its 86 year history. The historical aspects are important, and Vagris continues at some length on them, also mentioning that some members have participated in negative actions in the past. There is enough intellectual capacity in the party, he says, to overcome the adversities of the past.

The status of the Latvian Communist Party is the central issue. Under the conditions of a unitary state there is no place for an independent party. But breaking off from the Union has great dangers and does not consider the geopolitical situation, Vagris claims. But there is a third possibility, a gradual changeover, together with the radical forces in the Soviet Union, is the best way. At present there is no economic basis for a separate entity for Latvia. Working for economic independence is the right way.

Vagris also mentions his recent meeting with Gorbachev, at which they agreed to cooperate.

Restructuring the Latvian Communist Party has to be viewed considering internal and external aspects, i.e., in a multiparty system and within USSR reforms.

Vagris also talks about the great many new parties which he thinks are not always beneficial. Without going into too much detail, the aspects of the two main bodies, the party and the People's Front, should be analyzed. The People's Front has gained a major authority among the people. Vagris does not think Interfront will make much of an advance in gaining popularity. By law all parties should be given equal rights to pursue their activities.

At 1017 GMT Vagris interrupts his report for a lunch break until 1200 GMT.

Vagris Reports on Party Activities

LD0604133590

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1200 GMT on 6 April continues its live relay of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 1201 GMT Vagris continues his report, talking about material provisions for the party's activities. The party has already been working for some time under conditions of financial autonomy. The party needs its press, he says, but journalists have not always taken advantage of this opportunity.

On relations between the Latvian Communist Party and the CPSU, perhaps a representation should be established in Moscow which will also help the republic's road to sovereignty. The Latvian Communist Party will not follow the road of the Lithuanians, but it will cooperate with all parties.

There has been too dogmatic an approach in recalling communists from one organization or another. Mistakes have to be recognized.

Vagris talks about elections in which he notes degree of satisfaction.

There has been a polarization within the party concerning the sovereignty and independence of the Latvian Communist Party. In the elections the People's Front presented a united list, and is likely to obtain two-thirds of the seats at the Supreme Soviet. The party should also be able to work in the opposition.

The declining number of party members is a problem, according to Vagris. Without submitting to panic, the party should follow restructuring. Figures are giving an insight into party composition. The cadres selection is important. Although the apparatus has already been reduced, a new reorganization, too, should follow. Vagris explains what the new communists should be like for advances to be achieved. All this has to be done while the economic situation is poor.

Vagris talks at length about what has to be done in the economic field in the republic and the party's attitude toward the ecology and the environment.

It must be recognized that collectivization and deportations were a mistake. But by rectifying old mistakes new ones should not be made.

Nationality and internationality questions are important. Tensions have been increasing. Declarations, such as at the Forum of Peoples, are not always followed by practical actions. Vagris details the different nationality groups. A system of solving nationality problems should be established, he says.

The published draft program and rules of the party are ones of compromise. There is the possibility of leaving the congress by different doors, but it is important to leave by one door, i.e., for the party to remain united.

Income Sources Discussed

LD0604154190

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1246 GMT on 6 April continues its live relay of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

After Vagris' report, he answers a question on media coverage: Vagris tells the delegates that reporters have been requested to conduct interviews during intervals only, but not engage in any comments.

At 1248 GMT Bergs-Bergmanis, chairman of the party auditing commission, begins his report in detail, about membership fees and other sources and possible sources of income.

At 1300 GMT a debate on the report begins, with the chairman requesting adherence to the rule of 10 minutes for each speaker.

At 1301 GMT Klaucens, first secretary of the Riga city party committee, speaking in Russian, mentions talks in Moscow, the work begun by the city committee, and the case of the RIGAS BALSS newspaper, and the need for an alternative television service, as well as the importance of party unity.

At 1312 GMT the first secretary of Daugavpils rayon party committee stresses the importance of all nationalities in the republic working together and of one party.

At 1322 GMT Edvins Svars, first secretary of the Aluksne rayon party committee, talks about the proportion of nationalities in the republic and in the party, about the adverse effects of migration, that migrants have been thinking not of coming into a sovereign country but just to another part of the Union, and about the military. He mentions the crisis the party is facing and that an admission concerning the past should be made.

At 1331 GMT Balevica, secretary of Daugavpils city party committee speaking in Russian, and then in Latvian, stressing the importance of unity in the party.

At 1342 GMT the party committee secretary of Ventspils harbor works makes similar remarks on party unity.

At 1353 GMT Gorayev, first secretary of the Riga city Lenina Rayon party committee, speaking in Russian, supports party unity.

Historical Mistakes Viewed

LD0604190290

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1431 GMT on 6 April resumes its live relay of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 1432 GMT a Liepaja construction trust's party secretary speaks in Russian.

At 1443 GMT Guntis Kigulis, first secretary of Ogre party committee, begins to speak. He mentions the Baltic Road of last August, talks about the importance of history, and says that the idea of independence has arisen, but that cooperation with the East should be maintained.

At 1448 GMT Oleg (Patekhin), a delegate from Jekabpils Rayon of the Riga automobile electrical instruments works speaking in Russian, gives an extensive review of inter-republican and Union relations, and recent events.

At 1458 GMT Janis Lucans, chairman of board of an agrocombine in Limbazi Rayon, asks what the conservative wing of the party could offer the people, threats as the city of Riga Committee? Lucans says they had tried to expel Rukmane, and Lucans proposes expulsion of Klaucens in connection with the closure of the RIGAS BALSS. He continues that nobody guilty of the past misdeeds had been expelled. Vagris and Kezbers are not guilty, as some have tired to suggest, but the conservative wing is guilty. All who have collaborated with Voss ought to be expelled. Lucans proposes Vagris as candidate for the first secretary. If the party does not make amends, 10,000 members would leave, he says.

At 1507 GMT Davis Kampe, a school director from Valka Rayon, talks about history, Lenin, and the All-Russia's meat mincing machine, how Marxism-Leninism developed into Stalinism. He also discusses fear of history and the low authority of the party. The road of an independent Communist Party must be taken, he says. Kampe says he is speaking in the name of rank-and-file communists who did not understand Klaucens and others of his kind. Nothing is worse, as Lenin had said, as a Russified nationalist.

At 1513 GMT Lalin, first secretary of the city of Riga Leningradas Rayon of the party, speaks in Russian. He takes a serious approach to the problems of the party.

At 1522 GMT there is a proposal to lay flowers at the Lenin monument and a delegation for this is approved.

At 1524 GMT the speaker is Andrejs Dandzbergs, chairman of a collective fishery, who compares the lives of Latvian fishermen and those of Sweden and Denmark, and points to the achievements of socialism in this context. He stresses the wish for independence and the demand by Tukums Rayon communists for an independent Communist Party.

At 1533 GMT it is proposed to end work at 1600 GMT, because of the concerts at 1630 GMT.

At 1534 GMT (Bestronov), a party committee secretary of a Daugavpils trust, speaking in Russian, says that the Lithuanian version is a dead end.

At 1543 GMT a technician from Bauska Rayon speaks as the oldest communist present. He relates his past experiences and insists that the past crimes must be punished, pointing at Rubiks and asking where is his conscience? What belonged to the people should be given to the people and not be protected, as party property, by the Army in Lithuania, he says. There should be no surprise at the attitude of people—there is no communism when other people are being trampled on. He concludes with accusations about the damage done to Riga.

At 1556 GMT the director of a city of Riga Maskavas Rayon civil aviation establishment speaks in Russian.

At 1603 GMT Alfreds Cepanis is given the floor for two minutes and reads out a number of proposals for consideration.

at 1605 GMT Vagris invites the editorial commission for a largely organizational meeting to determine the work method, followed by a meeting of first secretaries. He anounces that the congress will resume tomorrow at 0600 GMT. At 1607 GMT the session ends.

Vagris Cited on 'Third Way' to Independence

LD0604210190 Moscow TASS in English 2040 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Riga April 6 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Valeriy Zaytsev:

Delegates of the 25th congress of the Latvian Communist Party that opened here on Friday are facing the alternative: Confrontation or consolidation? This is a difficult question to answer for 791 representatives of the 177,000-strong party. Several ideological platforms were formed inside the party during the past year. Communists grouped around them depending on their attitude to two closely interrelated and crucial problems—Latvia's independence as a state and the independence of the Latvian Communist Party. Several draft programme documents and draft rules were published ahead of the congress on behalf of those platforms.

Latvian Party Chief Jan Vagris pointed out in his political report that only the preservation of a radically renewed and organisationally united Latvian Communist Party is a key condition of political stability and democratisation. The status of the party, its place and role in the republic's political system and the character of future relations between the Latvian and Soviet Communist Parties are of crucial importance for all Latvian Communists.

The discussion before the congress revealed three possible approaches. The first envisages the preservation of the staus quo. The second, which is the opposite to the first one, consists in the following: All problems facing Latvia can be resolved quickly and effectively only by the immediate recording in the Constitution of its independent status and the severing of all state and legal relations with the USSR. However, Vagris continued, there is the third way, which, the Central Committee believes, is optimal for Latvia's conditions. It consists in the following: The restoration of sovereign statehood is not a purpose in itself, but a means to ensure civilised life for the Latvian people. Latvia can achieve real political independence only if its real economic independence is ensured. This is why Latvian communists support the idea of sovereign Latvia as part of the Union of Independent Socialist States, created on the basis of treaty relations.

During the discussion delegates criticised the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and its Bureau for their inability to control perestroyka processes. They pointed to the indecision of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee in assessing the situation in Communist parties of the Baltic Republics. It was stressed that the party would be as strong as it would be united.

Pugo Addresses 7 April Latvian CP Congress

LD0704141190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0726 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Speech by Boris Karlovich Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga on 7 April—live, in Russian]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! Life has confronted the communists of Latvia with many questions, but I consider it necessary to dwell on one aspect in my speech today. At the congress and in the labor collectives of the republic one can hear quite often the view that the fate of the country and perestroyka depends now on how things go in Lithuania. There is probably a portion of truth in these assertions. But let us put the question differently: do not things in Lithuania and the party depend today to the same degree on how your congress goes and what decisions it adopts? I believe that there are grounds for putting the question like that. Primarily, it calls upon congress delegates to take a broad view, considering the party as a whole, in their approach to the solution of issues, to see and take account of not only the interests of individual towns and districts, and not only the republic, but also the interests of the whole party and the interests of all our multiethnic federation. That very sort of broad view was taken at a conversation held at the CPSU Central Committee with the leadership of the Communist Party of Latvia; I won't hide the fact that it was frank and principled, but it was, at the same time, comradely. A pointed conversation is also going on here at the congress, concerning problems which truly worry all communists and all those who hold dear the destiny of the Communist Party of Latvia and the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic.

What is the essence of the main differences of opinion which have appeared here at the congress? If I may get away from points of secondary importance, I believe that they concern two highly important positions. First, should the renewed Communist Party of Latvia be independent, as is being said here, or within a renewed CPSU? The second question, closely connected with the first, is: Should a sovereign Latvia be within a renewed Federation or exist outside it? In one aspect or another, both these questions have been reflected in virtually all the speeches by congress delegates, and this is understandable. There is no dispute among us, in principle, on the view that the party must definitely renew itself. That is clear to everybody. The discussion begins when the question of ways of renewal and the appearance of the future party comes up. It is no secret that some communists would like to see the renewal of the party as just a slight, essentially cosmetic repair to the facade. They would like to reject the most scandalous deformations and errors of the past, but not change anything in the party's functions, forms, methods, and activity. On the other hand, there are those who would like to use the slogans of renewal to reject the Marxist-Leninist essence of the party and, at the same time, drive a wedge between the party and the people. There are also those who desire to split it according to, among others, the principle of nationality. I agree with those comrades who express the thought that all this is unacceptable to genuine communists.

In the context of today's discussion, I should like to ask myself this question: Why is only a Communist Party independent of the CPSU capable of becoming a genuine political force, as some comrades claim? Who has proved that only an independent Communist Party of Latvia can participate responsibly in the government of society and compete successfully with other parties and movements? I am confident that reasoned answers to these questions simply do not exist. The answer lies elsewhere. Evidently, there are forces with an interest in weakening the Communist Party of Latvia. Some people need that to realize their far-reaching political aims. It is for this that the notion of its independence from the CPSU is being thrown up.

At the same time, the experience of your southern neighbors, in particular, indicates that such an approach is fraught with the most serious consequences. Specifically, it is known that the plenum of the Central Committee of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania held recently recognized frankly that the split merely weakened the Communist Party. It lost the elections to the republic's supreme and local soviets. More and more communists are continuing to leave the party. The question of renaming it has already been raised. Calls to go over to social-democratic positions have been heard. It is not ruled out that, in the end, just one Communist Party will remain in Lithuania, and that it will be the one standing on the CPSU platform. Of course, the causes of what happened have still to be investigated. But, surely, the split of the Communist Party of Lithuania was one of the main causes of the Lithuanian communists' defeat? I think the answer to that question is obvious. So, is there any point in repeating that sad experience here, on Latvian soil?

The CPSU Central Committee is well aware of the difficulties, both objective and subjective, which the Communist Party of Latvia has faced of late. They were displayed graphically in the course of the recent election campaign. The January and March plenums of the Central Committee of the republic's Communist Party and the pointed discussion which has developed now at the congress show how topical the task of maintaining the unity of the Communist Party of Latvia, one of the oldest and most experienced communist parties in the country is.

We cannot fail to be worried by the demarcation which has taken shape in the republic's Communist Party, not only on ideological and political grounds, but also by nationality. This is extremely serious, and more than that. I would say that it is unnatural too, especially considering the revolutionary, internationalist traditions of the Communist Party of Latvia. I have to say that it is altogether difficult to find a communist party anywhere in the world which is oriented exclusively towards a particular ethnic milieu. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that, objectively a mono- ethnic communist party will have any prospects in mutli-ethnic Soviet Latvia. Sooner or later, it will reach self-dissolution.

Therefore, comrades, if the renewal of the party is viewed, not as a one-time action, but as a complex, protracted process, its success lies in the draft CPSU Central Committee platform and new party rules. This is the premise on which it is necessry to proceed. Many problems, including those which are causing such bitter disputes here, can be solved successfully on this basis. The draft CPSU rules lay down with adequate clarity the new status of the communist parties of union republics and their independence [samostoyatelnost], limited only by a general, strategic line, a line based on the fundamental principles and ideas of the CPSU rules and program. In everything else—selecting tactics, solving the issues of cadres, financing, and other problems—the republican communist parties are completely independent. I believe that this also creates a mechanism which makes it possible to untie successfully the knots of intraparty contradictions.

Comrades! While coming out resolutely against any attempts to separate the CPSU into national compartments, our party confirms its adherence to the right of nations to self-determination, up to and including the right of a union republic to detach itself and secede from the USSR. As is known, the Leninist approach to solving the nationalities issue is being subjected to bitter attack today from both left and right.

The practical task facing us is to revive the Leninist understanding of the self-determination of nations. It definitely takes account of objective trends and the internationalization of all spheres of social life. The CPSU sees the solution of this task in a transition to a diverse system of treaty-based relations and the establishment of equal economic ties among all Union republics.

But it should be clear to everybody that the secession of a republic from the Union is a highly complicated and, to put it bluntly, very painful process. If that question comes up, it will require, literally, cutting a live nerve and breaking the thousands of invisible threads which bind each Union republic to the whole country. Remember what a fever Latvia got into some time ago, when the Sloka pulp and paper works was closed down—for reasons absolutely independent of the center, incidentally. Yet that is just a small, individual case, by comparison with the chaos which might begin in the event of voluntaristic attempts to separate the republic from the USSR. I should not like to intimidate anybody, but I consider it my duty to call for good sense and genuine party and state wisdom. I have to say that the CPSU Central Committee has put forward a number of legislative initiatives concerning, in particular, the creation of a mechanism for the legal regulation of relations among republics in the new Federation. The concept of a renewed Union treaty must be the core of that work. The importance of the work in this area has been stressed once again in a speech by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. It is necessary to encourage this process in every way possible and exclude any attempts at unilateral actions, whatever good aims they might use as cover. In these matters one must in no event act just on the basis of narrowly-understood egoistic interests. The experience of your southern neighbors confirms again the correctness of this conclusion.

I am convinced that the proposals expressed in Latvia's party organization, including at this congress, on developing democracy and extending the rights and independence of the republic, will enrich our common vision of a renewed Federation. It should be borne in mind here that issues will not be solved by ultimatums and force but on the basis of the Constitution and regard for the vital interests of all Soviet people. Workers, collective farmers, the intelligentsia, servicemen in the Soviet Army, veterans, and young people have an equal interest in this today.

In general, comrades, it's not difficult to bang loudly on the door or suppress the minority in a vote. It is harder to show tolerance and a respectful attitude to a different opinion. In short, it is time for us to grow accustomed to living in conditions of true pluralism of views, to living together with people from whom differences of opinion divide us. This requires us to assimilate one of the most important rules of the new political thinking: Never to reject dialogue and a search for points of contact and sensible compromises.

I regard it as one of the most important tasks of the congress to dissociate itself from extremes, both from conservative positions, which support perestroyka in words only, and from extreme radicalism, which leads to a split in party ranks and ethnic isolation. The task of the congress is to find the ideological and organizational foundations for the cohesion of the party and to overcome alienation between rank-and-file members and the leadership and among communists of various nationalities. Both supporters of an independent Communist Party and communists who stand on the CPSU platform have to understand the vital importance of solving these tasks. I should like to appeal again to you, comrade delegates, to adopt decisions at the congress, acting on the basis that communists and the people of the republic and the whole of our country are bound by common cares and a common destiny.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

'Stormy Debates' as Latvian Congress Adjourns

LD0804125590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] After two days of stormy debates, as our correspondent reports from Riga, the 25th congress of the Latvian Communist Party has interrupted its work, to be continued after the 28th CPSU Congress.

The congress participants discussed a program for a way out of the crisis in the Latvian Communist Party. A new membership of the leading bodies in the republic's party organization was elected and a resolution was adopted supporting the Lithuanian and Estonian communists who have not broken off links with the CPSU.

Alfred Petrovich Rubiks was elected first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party's Central Committee.

Pugo Answers Questions at Latvian Congress

LD0804153490 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1037 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Speech and remarks by Boris Karlovich Pugo, candidate member of CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at Latvian Communist Party Congress—live relay]

[Text] [Sobolev, chairman] The floor is given to Boris Karlovich Pugo. Pay attention, comrades.

[Pugo, in Russian] I have not just one question, comrades. A delegate from the central rayon organization of the city of Riga asks. I did not know there was one—evidently, I have lost touch with life. This question is: Please give me an explanation on the CPSU Central Committee's attitude to the Democratic Platform, and what organizational conclusions are planned on this account?

This is, indeed, a very serious question. As you know well, CPSU Central Committee documents including the CPSU Central Committee platform, state that very broad discussion must develop in the party. It has indeed developed. A whole series of organizations have presented their platform. Very many platforms have been set up. I have recently read no fewer than five or six platforms for various organizations in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA alone. The Democratic Platform occupies a particular place. Speaking of its content, in general, apart from style and some details, it does not differ much, in essence, from CPSU Central Committee documents, although there are differencs of principle which we do not permit, linked, above all, to the existence of factions. But we say that pluralism of opinions is possible, the existence of one's own view and stance is possible, the minority has the right to express its views; all that is perfectly correct and probably cannot be doubted.

At the same time, regarding the Democratic Platform, in the opinion of the CPSU Central Committee, the aim of the organizers of the Democratic Platform is not to create a document, but to organize, essentially, subversive work in our party; and their aim is not to express their views, but, in essence, for the CPSU to cease to exist as such.

In this connection, in the next few days a letter will be sent to communists by the CPSU Central Committee, and it will be proposed that the position of the supporters of the Democratic Platform be examined and that a process of distancing oneself from its supporters be effected. Evidently there is an opportunity for those comrades who, as the phrase goes, are making an honest mistake in something to defend their stance and their point of view. But what is essentially involved today is not just the formation of a second party, but of an organization that would in essence deprive the CPSU of the ability to act as such. That is what the approach to the Democratic Platform will be. I would like to mention one other thing, incidentally. If there are communists who do not agree with the CPSU Central Committee platform out of considerations of principle and who perhaps have their own view on any other matters, it is not at all essential, comrades, to wait to be expelled from the party. Members are able to leave the CPSU. By the way, there are many such people. They have this right. But it seems we have today come up against a situation in which a number of comrades want to stay in the party until the 28th congress mainly out of considerations connected with assets. This, clearly, must not be permitted. A serious struggle will be waged with the Democratic Platform. [applause]

[First unidentified man] Comrades, before announcing the break...

[Second unidentified man, interrupting] Boris Karlovich, could I put a question to you?

[Pugo] Yes.

[Second unidentified man] Boris Karlovich, do you consider your arrival for the congress as your personal responsibility in light of the situation that has arisen in the party here in our republic, and what do you consider you left undone when you left for Moscow?

[Pugo] I did not understand the bit at the end. [murmurs of "What did you leave undone?"]

[Second unidentified man] Your move to Moscow was at a very difficult political period, it must be said, when the party had proclaimed perestroyka [words indistinct], when rallies were being held. The situation had to be explained (?by) the first secretary truthfully and objectively and the voice that (?admittedly) had in some measure, to be frank, been lost, had to be conveyed.

[Pugo] Comrades, I consider myself responsible for everything taking place in Latvia and what is taking place in the CPSU now. I cannot give any other answer. [brief applause]

[Rozenvalds] Delegate Rozenvalds I have a question. In the light of what you have just said, how do you see the prospects for turning the CPSU into a union of republican communist parties, bearing in mind that already, as you can see, the position on which people could, in principle, unite does not comply with the CPSU Central Committee platform.

[Pugo] I stand by the position published in the CPSU Central Committee platform, in which these matters are set out perfectly clearly. I don't propose to hide behind anything; this really does correspond to my heartfelt views on this problem. As to the way events will develop further, let us not try and peer into the future and guess what will happen. Very many proposals will be tabled for the 28th congress; that is indeed so. We will consider them together. That is why the 28th congress is being convened. I will be defending the line contained in the CPSU Central Committee platform. [applause]

Vagris Addresses 6 Apr Party Congress

LD0804182890 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0927 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Speech by Janis Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, on the first day of the Latvian Communist Party Congress in the House of Political Education in Riga—live]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Comrades, the sitution in the party is closely connected with the economic, political, ideological and moral crisis which our entire society is experiencing at present. Therefore, we can talk about overcoming the crisis in the party only in a direct interconnection with the restructuring of Latvian society itself. And this is nothing new. The general and specific aspects of solving the problems of society and the party have been much discussed, both from this rostrum and in the press.

In the course of a few weeks or months the conceptual formulations of the party cannot of course change, only new facts may emerge which allow a more vivid comprehension of this rule-of-law principle. In the basic draft program of the Communist Party of Latvia the sketches of this conception have been outlined, therefore there is hardly any sense in relating them once more. I think that here at the congress we must think about the consequences. Without doubt the question about the status of the Communist Party of Latvia, its place and role in the republic's political system, on the character of future mutual relations between the Communist Party of Latvia and the CPSU is the central question. We would look in vain for an answer to it in the attitude of communists toward the state status of Latvia: Its political system and relations with the USSR were not clear. In the pre-congress discussion in the party and in society three different approaches to this problem appeared.

The first one: Latvia, until now, remains formally sovereign, but, in fact, a component part of a unitary great power, with all the political and socioeconomic consequences arising from that. So in such an event, any kind of talk about the party's independence loses, essentially, sense, because political activity in conditions of a unitary state—as is proved by the previous decades—is best suited to a centralized party, with a rather restricted and heirarchically determined extent of rights and authorities of central organizations.

The second approach arises from the proposition that a quick and successful solution of all problems in Latvia wil be brought about only by its immediate transformation into a fully independent state, breaking off all state-legal ties with the USSR. In this instance, in its turn, any political or organizational bond of the Communist Party of Latvia with the CPSU becomes unrealistic; or, a reanimation of the Communist Internationale should be considered. However, this is a stretch of road already covered in its time, and we know well from history what that brought both to our party and the international communist movement.

So then, consistently keeping to this, the second approach, logically there is only the status of a fully independent political party which, moreover, in a rather near future would have to operate in conditions of, in principle, a different political system. It is clear that because of economic underdevelopment, a generally low political culture, a specific social and nationality infrastructure, and also other circumstances, an immediate attempt to abruptly and unilaterally break Latvia away from the rest of the Soviet Union will unavoidably lead only to a sharp confrontation in society.

Moreover, we have no kind of guarantee that this process would be peaceable, not violent—not even talking about democracy or respecting human rights. Most likely this could be crowned with a more or less open monopoly of power and ideology by right-wing forces, or, in other words, dictatorship.

Unfortunately, already we see today that political forces which are striving for a state of emergency in society are becoming more active.

We, on the one hand, condemn those times when the party asserted that it was the only leading and directing force in society, which understands and defends the interests of the people, but at the same time again almost every day we hear assertions of the same kind by other political forces.

There is also not the slightest doubt that a hasty [forsets] breaking-up of the diverse relations beween Latvia and the rest of the Soviet Union would mean in practice a militant anticommunism, the first manifestations of which can already be clearly seen: Persecution of those holding different opinions, and other phenomena which in no way can be connected with concepts such as democracy, human rights, pluralism of opinions, social protectiveness of pesonality and similar.

I think you will agree with that both of these approaches, which, in fact, exclude one another, and not acceptable to us on principle, for we are a democratic party of left-wing forces, a party of socialist choice.

These approaches profoundly contradict the democratic, creative essence of the policy of restructuring, its goals and tasks. The first approach alone because of the fact that in the name of the unitarism and centralism which was cultivated for years it ignored the inalienable rights of the people to self-determination. And the second one because it does not take into account the existing geopolitical and socioeconomic realities and correlates—entirely without grounds—the efforts of leaders of organizations defending opinions involving social revenge and a monopoly of political power, with the achievement of the interests and legal rights of the entire people of Latvia.

There is however yet a third approach which, to my mind, in Latvia's circumstances is the most optimal. It arises from the following basic concepts.

First, restoration of a sovereign statehood is not an end in itself, but a means to ensuring a civilized existence for the people of Latvia.

Second, the process of restoration of state sovereignty to Latvia, corresponding to the principles of realistic democracy and human rights, is not, and cannot be the result of a single act. It must be a purposeful, gradual changeover period, during which, by democratic means, not only the interests of the republics and neighboring countries but at the same time the rights and legal interests of the indigenous nation and the other ethnic groups living in Latvia, and also of various social strata, are coordinated.

Third, dismantling the old administrative/bureaucratic system has by no means yet been completed. The new democratic institutions are as yet fragile and cannot be guaranteed to withstand possible nationality conflicts and social shocks.

Therefore, the democratic left-wing forces of Latvia must, without doubt, support the USSR radical restructuring forces, and must probably even be at their forefront. It is in our interests to further restructuring and democratization in the entire Soviet Union. In this way we will able to guarantee in the shortest time to everybody, and, of course, first of all to our people, security and stability.

Fourth, political independence can be possible only when economic independence has been secured. But today in Latvia there is no such economic structure characteristic of a sovereign state. Over the years diverse economic ties have developed and increased which unite the national economy of Latvia with the USSR, its raw material resources and sale marks for goods. It is natural that any complications in this sphere—which are already arising as a result of various inconsiderable political actions and are not excluded also in the future—will, after all, first of all have a negative effect upon the republic's economy, the living standard of its inhabitants, which, as you already now, is not particularly high.

In order to form and to consolidate the republic's economic independence, which is the only thing guaranteeing normal life and work to its inhabitants, a number of radical transformations must be affected. We shall return to them in more detail. Here it is important to emphasize that an essential precondition of achieving them is stability concerning internal policy in Latvia and thorough, thought-through preparation.

Therefore, already this year legislative foundations have to be fully drawn up and adopted in order to reorganize all production relations. And on this basis, really, economic reform in industry, agrarian reform, prices, finance and the credit system's reform must also begin.

These conclusions to my mind testify that the political and economic prospects of the state and people of Latvia, at least until the economic and sociopolitical crisis is completely resolved, depend on how successful and the joint efforts of the democratic forces of the entire Soviet Union in forming a new interstate union in the place of the present, in essence a unitary state, on foundations comprising an equal-rights dialogue, and balancing of interests and treaties. [passage omitted]

Independents Walk Out of Latvian Congress

LD0704185190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] We have just received new information about the work of the extraordinary 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Latvia. Our correspondent, Ninel Meshkun, reports from Riga that stormy debates arose during the discussion of the charter of the Communist Party of Latvia and the program to find a way out of the crisis in the Communist Party of Latvia. The delegates decided by a majority vote not to pass them, but to propose that a new Central Committee should work on them. Then representatives of the supporters of an independent Communist Party of Latvia made a statement that, in connection with the fact that the basic documents on which a consensus could have been achieved had been rejected, they had decided to hold their constituent congress on 14 April.

What, actually, are their basic demands? That it be recognized at the 25th congress that the aim of the party is social justice and freedom, and a free and independent Latvia; that the party should be completely independent; that the Communist Party of Latvia reject the theses of the construction of a communist society; and that the multiplicity of all forms of property, including private property, be recognized. If all these points are approved, we will not insist on our own congress.

The ultimatum of the independents was not adopted, and they walked out of the hall at 1800 [1500 GMT]. So far, it has not been possible to preserve the unity of forces.

Riga Radio Carries 7 Apr Latvian CP Congress

Party Renewal Stressed

LD0704160690

[Editorial Report] Riga Dopmestic Service in Latvian at 0600 GMT on 7 April begins live coverage of the second day of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

Arnold Klautsen, first secretary of the Riga city party committee and speaking in Russian, opens the proceedings.

Vitaliy Sobolev, chairman of the Mandate Commission, presents the commission's report.

At 0610 GMT Sobolev invites questions on the report. After 15 minutes of debate on the report, it is put to a vote. An unidentified speaker asks for the number of delegates present to be made known. It is announced that there are 779 delegates present.

The results of the vote on the mandate commission's report are announced: 531 votes for, 211 against, and 37 abstain.

Proceedings continues at 0635 GMT with a speech in Russian by Prokofyev, first secretary of the Oktobra Rayon committee in Riga.

At 0648 GMT Jurijs Rubenis, a former chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, begins speaking in Russian. He concludes at 0701 GMT.

At 0708 GMT after a speech by delegate Podnieks, the floor is given to Lt. Gen. Fedor Kuzmin, commander of the Baltic Military District. Kuzmin speaks in Russian.

On the crisis in Latvia, Kuzmin asks why the party has not managed to restore its vanguard role. The party has given up the intellectual high ground to the People's Front and lacks a clear program for action, he says. The party has not done enough to rid itself of unhealthy forces within its ranks, and the gulf between words and deeds in party renewal has been too wide. The experience of the Lithuanian party shows that renewal is impossible outside the CPSU; separatism is worthless. Some are spreading anti-Army publications, which must be repulsed, Kuzmin urges. Pacifism must not receive legal backing: the right to life and the duty to defend it must be guaranteed. The Baltic region would not be able to stand aside in the event of an East-West conflict. The People's Front appeals to young men to refuse the spring call-up are nothing other than provocations, he says. Servicemen must not be isolated form the republic's social and political life, Kuzmin stresses. Local authorities discriminate against the Army with regard to servicemen's living conditions. Kuzmin thinks the Army's appeals to the Latvian Party Central Committee are not receiving enough attention. The program being debated here should be sent to the 28th CPSU Congress as a proposal, Kuzmin concludes.

At 0719 GMT Anton Bril, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, speaking in Russian, speaks about the future role of the party and explains the content of a recent meeting with Gorbachev and other Moscow leaders. The Latvian goal is an independent party under democratic, humane socialism Bril says, emphasizing the word independent [samostoyatelnyy]. The party seeks a sovereign, civil society; this does not conflict with CPSU policy. He calls on delegates to stand solidly behind the Latvian party's proposals.

Delegates Debate Party Unity

LD0704160790

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian continues its live coverage of the second day of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 0726 GMT Boris Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, is invited to speak. Pugo speaking in Russian, notes that the fate of perestroyka depends to a great degree on events in Lithuania, but equally on the decisions adopted by this Latvian congress. A frank, principled but comradely conversation was held recently at the CPSU Central Committee with Latvian party leaders, he notes. For this congress, Pugo says, the key questions are whether the renewed party should be within or outside the CPSU and whether the republic should be within or outside the USSR. Everybody knows that the party must be renewed; the argument is about how, he says. Agrees that calls for a split are unacceptable to genuine communists. Some forces have an interest in weakening the Latvian Communist Party. He says the experience of our "southern neighbors" shows it is dangerous for the party to split off from the CPSU, for the Lithuanian party split is obviously the cause for its defeat. It is important to maintain unity within the Latvian Communist Party. The knots of intraparty contradictions can be united within a party inside the CPSU Pugo says, adding that Latvia secession from the USSR would mean severing thousands of invisible ties with the rest of the country. I do not wish to frighten anybody, Pugo says, but it is my duty to call for common sense. The policy of broadening the rights of repubics within a renewed federation is the right path; this meets everybody's interests. We have to live in genuine pluralism, avoiding both extremes. Delegates should bear in mind that we have common cares and a common destiny, Pugo says in conclusion.

At 0742 GMT Fricis Zimins, an agricultural firm chairman from Riga Rayon asks why the other speakers did not speak in Latvian and then talks about those who have come to Latvia not understanding Latvians. Lithuanian and Estonian parties have chosen their way, says Zimins, and the Latvian party should as well.

At 0755 GMT Varnas, first secretary of the Balvi Rayon party committee, speaking in Russian, reports on his rayon's attitude toward party affairs.

After Varnas finishes, a 25-munute break until 0830 GMT is announced.

At 0841 GMT after a procedural delay, the session resumes. The floor is given to Strogonov, first secretary of the Ludzad Rayon party committee. Strogonov, speaking in Russian, talks about the common road for everybody. In his rayon, an internatioanl one, he says, there are no ethnic differences. Stressing the need for unity, he thinks that the program should not be only for the party but for the entire people. All problems have not been told to Gorbachev, Strogonov says, adding that present life can not continue as it has for decades. He suggests that a commission be established for drawing up an acceptable program.

At 0850 GMT a physicial culture club manager speaks in favor of independence and an independent party.

At 0855 GMT Ivanov, a foreman at the railway repairs works in Daugavpils begins speaking in russian. He is against there being two parties in Lativa. Ivanov thinks the party should preserve an actual political power against counter forces.

At 0906 GMT Doctor (?Boradulin) speaking in Russian as a rank- and-file communist, talks about the need to preserve a strong party in the republic.

At 0916 GMT Dimanis, a lecturer at the Latvian State University, talks about the economy. After 50 yeaurs in the Soviet Union, Dimanis says, there are economic ties which can not be broken.

At 0925 GMT Interfront Chairman Aalekseyev, speaking in Russian, thinks that there should be different leadership.

At 0934 GMT a secretary of the Jelgava party committee speaks in Russian.

Ideology, Politics Debated

LD0704160890

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian continues its live coverage of the second day of the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 0944 GMT Latvian Foreign Minister Eizens Pocs speaks, mentioning the present developments before turning to the Comintern. He appeals for realism; lessons have to be learned, and only then can it be considered which way Latvia should go. There are those who advocate Marxism, he notes, but Marxism should probably be purified. The party should accept the challenge by the people for independence, Pocs says. There should be differentiation between politics and ideology Pocs says, and concludes that professionalism will be able to take Latvia out of its difficulties.

At 1000 GMT Urbanovics, first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee, talks about parallel crisis in the party and the Komsomol. His organization guarantees stability. As has been seen in other republics, an organization which has been faceless for 70 years can not obtain stability in the eyes of the people. Such an organization has to be independent, and its members must be able to freely participate in any other public/political organization, he says. Although Klausen has said on television that the Komsomol is not operating, they have done a great deal, Urbanovics says.

At 1014 GMT Vagris replies to various questions.

At 1032 GMT auditing commission chairman A.K. Berg-Bergman replies to four questions.

At 1037 GMT Boris Pugo is given the floor. He speaks until 1041 GMT and answer questions until 1044 GMT.

At 1045 GMT a break until 1215 GMT is announced.

Party Resolution Debated

LD0704171990

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1223 GMT on 7 April resumes its live coverage from the

Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 1223 GMT, prior to the resumption of the congress, interviews are conducted in Russian by two radio reporters, Peteris Tabuns and Alfreds Leiterts. A delegate from Limbazi is asked for his observation on the Congress. A woman from Gulbene says that there are people with whom she would not like to be in the same party, and there is a feeling among the country people that they would prefer not to belong to any party.

Ivars Kazbers is interviewed next. He feels that the congress has been worse than expected; at least Pugo had spoken as a man, but this showed that nothing would be achieved, he says. The congress should have shown a solution, but it has not. Referring to Lithuania, Kazbers says that there should be a moratorium on the documents adopted. He does not agree with the Lithuanians and supports compromise concerning the party problems in Latvia. Kezbers says that whatever happens, he will continue to work in Latvia. He says that he had already refused two offers to go abroad.

At 1314 GMT the Latvian Communist Party Congress resumes with Vagris in the chair. Rubiks is given the floor on behalf of the editorial commission, apologizing that their work has taken longer than envisaged, and he continues with his report in Russian, giving details of their prepared program/resolution.

At 1319 GMT Porietis begins to speak. He describes the satisfactory conditions in the republic, and praises the present leadership.

At 1320 GMT Rubiks apologizes, in Russian, for not including these leaders in the resolution, and Vagris says that this altered the situation.

At 1322 GMT Rozenvalds asks for the principles proposed by Cepanis to be considered.

At 1324 GMT, Vagris has a criticism, and a member of editorial commission replies and reads the text in Russian. Others comment that it was not clear whether it is more important to overcome the crisis in the republic or to remain on the platform of the CPSU. Brief exchanges on this subject continue.

At 1330 GMT there are several proposals for the resolution, all in Russian. Alekseyev accuses leaders by name, there is some commotion in the hall, but Vagris says that everybody present could be blamed.

At 1335 GMT a delegate suggests that perhaps also a rurual person could participate in Latvian, as they were all speaking Russian. Brief exchanges, at times quite heated, continue in Russian.

At 1348 GMT Cepanis asks for a vote to be taken on two points of principle. Another Latvian delegate proposes voting point by point of draft resolutions. Arguments continue, mostly in Russian.

At 1358 GMT a woman, in Latvian, objects to anonymous forces included in the text. Rubiks says that the decision's author has not been specified, and explains the mutual accusations by the fronts. Rubiks says that the forces are those that would like to take the party out of the CPSU and the republic out of the Soviet Union. Vagris suggests that the editorial commission could not specify, and this is voted on.

Walk-out by Delegates

LD0704173690

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1404 GMT on 7 April continues its live coverage from the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 1404 GMT a Latvian speaker remarks that it is due to the leadership that there has not been bloodshed and other misfortunes. Prolonged arguments by many participants, entirely in Russian, complaining that the work of the Central Committee had not been satisfactory.

At 1414 GMT a vote on the wording is taken. A majority, 476, vote in favor; 284 vote against; 21 abstentions. The work is considered unsatisfactory.

At 1420 GMT Auzins, in Latvian, categorically objects to this point. Rubiks takes offence being a USSR people's deputy. Vagris says that there is no cause for offense, he had been mentioned as an example.

At 1423 GMT Vagris suggests voting on whether to exclude this point and it is decided by vote to exclude this point.

At 1427 GMT the next item is postponed, and another is discussed.

At 1430 GMT the last item on the agenda is discussed.

At 1435 GMT a majority approves the commission's wording.

At 1437 GMT a Latvian speaker voices an objection concerning a proposal adopted by the editorial commission.

At 1444 GMT Rubiks continues, in Latvian, about a document which had been distributed to the delegates, about which there had been differences at the editorial commission. Discussion begins on the document prepared by the Central Committee plenum. Vagris, Rubiks, and a Russian speaker voice their views.

At 1452 GMT a woman in Latvian says that the entire booklet of documents had been discussed at the editorial commission. Russian contributions continue.

At 1455 GMT a Latvian objects that from the program they had moved to the status.

At 1459 GMT a vote is held on the new program of the party; more than 200 vote in favor; the new program is not adopted.

At 1500 GMT Cepanis, speaking in the name of the more than 200, announces that there is no reason for them to remain, they would meet on 14 April, and they walk out of the congress.

At 1503 GMT Vagris announces a 20 minute break.

Delegates Continue Debate

LD0704192490

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1559 GMT on 7 April resumes its live coverage from the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga. The relay is now being broadcst from a smaller hall of the House, where supporters of the independent Communist Party of Latvia have gathered.

Vasermanis, a delegate from Jelgava, says that they should continue their work, they are all still delegates.

At 1607 GMT Vasermanis suggests application for recognization of their mandates to the organizers of the 14 April congress of the proposed independent Communist Party.

At 1608 GMT Juris Rozenvalds speaks, saying that they should continue discussing the program of the Central Committee which had just been rejected. (?Rozenvalds) reads the draft proposals and suggests that they should personally vote for it.

A woman suggests that they should not vote, yet.

At 1615 GMT detailed additions and proposals continue in the form of an informal discussion. Individual speakers are not announced.

At 1620 GMT "the secretary" is greeted on his arrival by prolonged applause. This may be a reference to Daudiss, secretary of Supreme Soviet Presidium. Kezbers is also present. It is reported that in the "big hall" they do not have the necessary two-thirds majority.

At 1623 GMT Marite Rukmans begins to speak. At 1625 GMT (?Cepanis) speaks.

At 1628 GMT another speaker says that the arrival of Pugo had shown that what is acceptable in Moscow is not acceptable in Riga.

At 1630 GMT Kezbers begins to speak. He feels that they had acted properly. They should take the documents as a basis. These were not yet ready, but would serve the purpose. Kezbers stresses that he supports statehood and independence, and with it an independent party. He says that he would probably not be too popular, but he feels that they should not break the ties with the CPSU. He also gives his opinion about Lithuania. He suggests that Pugo should be invited, and the position be explained. He says that he remains a Gorbachevist and supports restructuring.

At 1638 GMT Rozenvalds speaks again, and suggests a further procedural action.

At 1642 GMT Cepanis suggests a vote on the documents read earlier by Rozenvalds.

At 1643 GMT Vorontsev, in Russian, speaks about the "third way", that they expressed solidarity with efforts to achieve an independent party.

At 1645 GMT Andreja Cirulis, editor of LATVIJAS JAUNATNE, reads historical information on the House of the Press, giving the background to the property rights which could prove useful in the future. The same could happen to it as to the Press House in Lithuania, he says.

At 1655 GMT Cepanis proposes the election of three persons to go and inform the Congress—"Cepanis will not go there," he says.

Although there is a suggestion to disperse and convene on 14 April, they decide to await the return of the delegation.

At 1657 GMT reportage from the gathering of supporters of the independent Communist Party of Latvia concludes.

Party Independence Debated

LD0704195890

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1658 GMT on 7 April continues its live coverage from the Latvian Communist Party Congress at the House of Political Education in Riga.

At 1700 GMT the broadcast returns to the congress in the big hall, where Kezbers reports about the events.

At 1702 GMT there is proposals to continue work, and Vagris invites Rubiks to propose items for further disucssion. Another man reads the proposals.

At 1705 GMT Rubiks considers proposals in connection with Cepanis, and then continues with other matters. At 1709 GMT discussion continues by several delegates with contributions from the hall. Rubiks continues to play prominent role. Wording is discussed concerning the party remaining within the CPSU.

With Vagris in the chair, discussion on separate items continues, with some voting, until 1747 GMT.

At 1748 GMT there is a mention of some delegates going to their rayons for consultations.

At 1749 GMT Vagris, speaking in Russian and Latvian, expresses thanks to the radio. The Latvian reporter explains that the congress will continue in a closed session.

Pugo Views New Voices at Latvian Party Congress

LD0704222190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Interview with Boris Karlovich Pugo, former first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, by correspondent Ninel Melshkun; in Riga on 7 April—recorded]

[Text] [Meshkun] On a clear spring day, a snowstorm suddenly blew up and large snowflakes started to fall. It was as if the weather were reacting to the sharp movement of the political barometer at the congress. The reaction to the speeches accurately reflected the mood of the hall and of the supporters of the platform being defended by the deputies. Alas! They were icy.

I spoke to Boris Karlovich Pugo, who worked in Latvia for many years and headed the party organization in the republic one and one- half years ago.

Boris Karlovich, until very recently there was this hall and this rostrum and people we had seen and heard for years at this rostrum and [word indistinct] their speeches. Now here is this hall and this rostrum, but the voice from the rostrum has changed radically, I would say. Do you recognise these people?

[Pugo] Yes, indeed, I worked in Latvia for a long time, and I really considered that I knew many people very well because we had occasion to do a lot together. In evaluating our successes and failures in our complex time, I would like to say that even at that time quite a lot of good things were done in the republic, which probably quite simply no one has the right to deny. If we are to speak of the voices, these have changed considerably. The debates started today. I noticed for myself that of practically the first six speakers, three spoke about how the party must be comprehensible to the people, and only the evaluation of the people will make it possible for the party to occupy its proper place. Probably such an approach is the right one, but at the same time some comrades, in my opinion, are still confused to some extent.

It is no secret that the Communist Party of the republic, the Latvian one and in the Baltic republics as a whole...[changes thought] that at the last elections the Communists did not come out on top. A new situation is arising in the parliaments; it is already there in a completely new way, obviously, in Lithuania and Estonia. In the Latvian republic, too, it will be significantly different from what it was before. The fact that the Communists are discussing and evaluating the results of their work in a much more demanding way is a good thing. It is also a fact that it is necessary to acquire conviction in the correctness of their cause. The basis for such conviction exists.

[Meshkun] The debates have ended and discussion of the congress documents has begun. No one is indifferent, for the fate of the Communist Party of Latvia is being decided now. Will it preserve its unity?

Caucasus

Anniversary of Tbilisi Demonstration Commemorated

Gorbachev Message

LD0704213490 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 7 Apr 90

[Text] April 9th marks the first anniversary of the tragic events in Georgia's capital, Tbilisi. On that day, troops used force to disperse a peaceful demonstration and there were casualties.

President Gorbachev has addressed the people of the republic to express sincere sympathy to the Georgian people and the families of those killed.

At this hour, the president says in his message, I would like to express once again my respect for Georgia and its industrious people, distinguished by glorious traditions, and unique culture, and friendliness. I am certain that all the problems of perestroyka in the republic will be overcome and the people of Georgia, in the union with fraternal peoples, will display their bright talent and energy in efforts to build a democratic and humane socialist society.

Leningrad Rally Held

AU0804192090 Paris AFP in English 1858 GMT 8 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow, April 8 (AFP)—About 10,000 people rallied in Leningrad Sunday to commemorate the brutal crushing of a protest in Georgia a year ago and to demand that troops be kept out of civilian conflicts, a witness said. The rally came as Georgians prepared a massive peaceful demonstration in the republic's capital, Tbilisi. Twenty people, 16 of them women, were killed when troops broke up a nationalist rally there on the night of April 8-9 last year.

The Leningrad protesters passed their resolution "so that Tbilisi is not repeated in Lithuania", said Boris Rovda, a Soviet journalist at the rally. Moscow has been waging a war of nerves with Lithuania since the Baltic republic declared independence on March 11. Soviet troops there have made their presence felt, but there have been no clashes with local people.

Leningrad demonstrators waved banners which read "yes to Lithuanian independence, no to the diktats of the president emperor" and "Thieves in the Kremlin, tanks in Lithuania". The rally was reported on Soviet television. The protest, organised by several pro-democracy groups, had been authorised by city officials, after an appeal from local elected representatives—most of whom are strong supporters of reform.

The resolution also contained an appeal to the Nobel Committee not to consider Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for the Nobel Peace Prize.

A highlight of the rally was an address by an examining magistrate and MP [member of parliament], Nikolay Ivanov, who accused what he called "the Kremlin mafia" of doing nothing except defend their own personal interests. Without mentioning Mr. Gorbachev by name, Mr. Ivanov warned that the Soviet leadership "should not forget what happened in Romania", when the hardline communist leadership was toppled last December by a popular uprising. Mr. Ivanov, a member of the Congress of People's Deputies, the country's extended parliament, called for "meetings and strikes, which is the only way to accelerate the democratic process, while keeping pressure on parliament. "We are millions and they are only a handful" he said to rousing applause. He concluded by saying that it could be his last public speech.

The crowd responded to his warning with anguished cries of "no, no" and carried him on their shoulders to his car, Mr. Rovda said.

Mr. Ivanov, along with a friend and fellow magistrate Telman Gdlyan, have faced a year-long parliamentary enquiry into their handling of a bribery and corruption investigation, which ended in December 1988 with the conviction of Yuriy Churbanov, the son-in-law of former Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev. The board of enquiry is due to announce its conclusions later this week—and could call for the judges' parliamentary immunity to be lifted on the grounds that they exceeded their powers while investigating allegations of corruption among high-ranking officials.

In Tbilisi, a torch-lit midnight vigil is to be followed by a pre-dawn mass celebrated early Monday by the Georgian patriarch Catholicos Ilya II.

Monday will be a day of mourning in the republic, with demonstrations in many places. The biggest is scheduled for Monday evening in the Tbilisi stadium.

Delegations are expected from neighbouring Armenia and Azerbaijan, and leaders of the main Georgian independence groups are due to speak.

Crowds Rally in Tbilisi

AU0904072790 Paris AFP in English 2243 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Paola Messena report]

[Excerpts] Tbilisi, Soviet Union, April 9 (AFP)—Some 100,000 people held a peaceful demonstration late Sunday in Tbilisi, capital of Soviet Georgia, to commemorate the brutal killings of 20 demonstrators by Soviet troops here a year ago.

They assembled at midnight, exactly a year after Soviet soldiers armed with spades and nerve gas killed 20 people, 16 of them women, who were attending a nationalist rally.

Many in the crowd, demonstrating in front of the government building on whose steps the 20 were slain, were young people carrying candles. At midnight a men's choir sang national songs to clenched fist salutes from the crowd.

Numerous delegations from the Soviet republics were present—Azeris, Armenians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Lithuanians, Latvians—along with a few foreign delegations.

They waved banners reading "Occupation forces, assassins, leave Georgia," "Solidarity with Lithuania," and "Gorbachev, hands off Lithuania."

The meeting was addressed by various nationalist leaders. Irakli Tsereteli, head of the Party for National Independence, was given an ovation when he called for the departure of the Soviet Army from Georgia.

After two hours the crowd started to disperse peacefully.

Georgian militiamen kept a discreet eye on the proceedings. Last year they had tried to hold off the army and defend the demonstrators. [passage omitted]

In Tbilisi, the midnight vigil was to be followed by a pre-dawn mass celebrated early Monday by the Georgian patriarch Catholicos Ilya II.

Monday will be a day of mourning in the republic, with demonstrations in many places. The biggest is scheduled for Monday evening in the Tbilisi stadium.

More on Tbilisi Rally

AU0904092690 Paris AFP in English 0909 GMT 9 Apr 90

[Paola Messina report]

[Text] Tbilisi, Soviet Union, April 9 (AFP)—More than 100,000 people held an emotional all-night rally in the Georgian capital Tbilisi to commemorate the brutal killing of 20 nationalist demonstrators by Soviet troops a year ago and demand independence for the Soviet republic.

Late Sunday evening there was already no room to move on Chota Rustaveli Avenue, the city's main thoroughfare.

In the mild spring weather, entire families made their way on foot down the steep streets to converge on government house, a huge building dating from 1950s, which houses the republic's Supreme Soviet (parliament), cabinet office and various ministries.

It was at a nationalist rally in front of this building that the 20 victims, 16 of them women, were felled by soldiers armed with spades and nerve gas.

At midnight a male voice choir broke into a traditional Georgian chant. The crowd took up the refrain, raising their fists. Hundreds of them lit tiny candles as nationalist leaders took up places on the steps of the building, piled high with flowers and wreaths.

In front of a sea of flags in the colours of independent Georgia—black, white and red—the movement's young president Irakli Tsereteli called for a minute's silence in memory of the dead.

The crowd fell silent immediately, but lifted their fists.

He resumed his address with a declaration that "the tragedy of April 9 1989 has not broken the will of Georgians, but on the contrary has reinforced their determination, which no spade or gas will be able to stop."

Delegations from other Soviet republics seeking independence had come to offer their support—Armenia, Azerbaijan, the Ukraine and the Baltic repubics of Latvia and Lithuania, which unilaterally declared independence from Moscow on March 11. There were also foreign delegations, including one from Cyprus.

Demonstrators waved banners in Georgian, reading "Occupation forces, assassins, leave Georgia" and "Glory to the innocent victims attacked by the Russian army".

One in English said "Gorbachev, hands off Lithuania". Another signed by Azeri nationalists affirmed "We understand your mourning. We are with you".

Sources close to the nationalists said around 20,000 Azeris had arrived here over the weekend.

Earlier 10,000 people demonstrated their solidarity with Georgians in Leningrad.

The rally was addressed by various nationalist leaders in turn. Only one was absent from the podium, the president of the popular front, Notar Natadze, who takes a more flexible approach to Moscow than Mr. Tsereteli's Party for National Independence.

Zviyad Gamsakhourdiya, the most widely respected nationalist figure, called on his compatriots to remain united in the struggle.

At 4:00 a.m. —the hour when the Soviet troops moved in to disperse demonstrators a year ago—the patriach of Georgia, Catholicos Ilya II said a mass in memory of the dead. A year ago the patriarch had exhorted the crowd in vain to go home to bed.

The crowd observed a 15-minute silence, broken only by the sound of bells, before the mass was celebrated on the steps of government house before 70,000 people. Sick people were brought to the service by ambulance.

In his sermon the patriarch said that while April 9 had been a tragic day, it had also been a day of rebirth for the Georgian people.

The crowd finally began to disperse slowly at 5:00 a.m.

Monday has been declared a day of mourning throughout the republic, with many demonstrations planned throughout the day, the biggest in Tbilisi stadium on Monday evening.

Armenian Communist Party 1st Secretary Elected

LD0604121990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1200 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Yerevan, 6 Apr. (TASS)—The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee plenum which was held here today acceded to the request of Suren Arutyunyan to be relieved of his duties as first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee in connection with his transfer to other work.

Vladimir Movsisyan, who previously worked as first deputy chairman of the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and as chairman of the republic's state agro-industrial committee, has been elected first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

Secretary Movsisyan Profiled

LD0604150290 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Yerevan April 6 TASS—A plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee has relieved Suren Arutyunyan of his duties as first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party at his request in connection with his transition to another job.

Vladimir Movsisyan, Armenian first deputy prime minister and chairman of the Armenian state agro-industrial committee, was elected new party chief. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 6 April in its report on the plenum adds: "Those attending the plenum were addressed by Comrade Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Polituburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee."]

Movsisyan was born on November 12, 1933 in the village of Shenavan of the Spitak region in a peasant family. He is Armenian.

In 1958 Movsisyan graduated with honours from the Yerevan Zoological and Veterinary Institute and then worked in his speciality.

In 1969 Movsisyan graduated from the higher party school at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and was assigned to party work. He was elected secretary of the Regional Committee of the Armenian Communist Party and worked as the deputy head of the Agricultural Department of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee.

From 1978 until 1984, Movsisyan was Armenian deputy prime minister. In January 1984, Movsisyan became Armenia's first deputy prime minister. From December 1985, Movsisyan combined the work as first deputy prime minister with the post of chairman of the Armenian State Agro-Industrial Committee.

Movsisyan has been heading the republican commission of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the Armenian Soviet of Ministers for refugees since February 1988 and emergency headquarters since January 1990.

Movsisyan is married, has two sons and four grandchildren.

Movsisyan Addresses Plenum

NC0804064890 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 8 Apr 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] On its front page the paper has published the speech delivered by Vladimir Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, at the plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Movsisyan said: I am greatly touched by the confidence shown in me. I fully realize the weight of the responsibility placed upon me at this fateful and grave time for the republic. Under present conditions, the utmost cohesion of efforts by the people, the party, and all public organizations and movements is required to face the trials and extricate the republic from the crisis situation.

I believe in the logical progress of radical transformations in our life and link our people's future to its success. I am deeply convinced that only through radical transformation and adherence to the supreme interests of the nation can the Armenian Communist Party acquire the moral right to shoulder its historic responsibility for the fate of the people. I am deeply convinced that we can succeed only when each person realizes the importance of his labor within the general endeavor, transcends personal and group interests, and partakes in his people's anguish and concerns. Today these are not mere empty words. This is our only path. Our people have survived thanks to their wisdom, industriousness, and [word indistinct] and we must highly value these qualities. We are also ready to cooperate with all those national and public movements and organizations whose thoughts and actions serve the fundamental interests of the Armenian people.

Armenian, Azerbaijani Procurators Present Reports

LD0604191490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An expanded session of the USSR Procuracy heard reports from Ismailov and Nazaryal, the procurators of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Armenian SSR respectively, on working on strengthening legality and law and order, and also on implementation of the decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet of 5 March of this year aimed at normalizing the situation in the region. It also heard a report by leaders of the interior ministries and KGB of those republics, and of the transportation and military procurators.

The session assessed the work of the Procuracy bodies and determined concrete measures by the Union law enforcement departments to assist the republican bodies and to intensify the coordination of their actions, especially in border rayons.

Prosecutors Criticized

LD0604221590 Moscow TASS in English 2156 GMT 6 Apr 90

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—Azerbaijani Public Prosecutor Ilias Ismailov and Armenian Public Prosecutor Vladimir Nazaryan have made reports at an extended session of the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office. They spoke about the consolidation of law and order and the fulfilment of the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet of March 5, 1990, which is aimed at normalising the situation in the region. The session also heard reports of heads of the Interior Ministries and State Security Committees (KGB) of the two republics, of their transport and military prosecutors.

It was pointed out that prosecutor's offices of the two republics had exerted some efforts to stop inter-ethnic conflicts and massive unrest resulting from it. At the same time, the collegium seriously criticised defects in their work.

Heads of the Armenian prosecutor's office adopted a conciliatory stand with regard to the illegal formation of para-military units. They did not organise strict control over the fulfilment by militia workers whose task it was to search for and arrest all those who captured fire arms and military equipment and to institute criminal proceedings against them. As a result of it, the criminals are at large with a considerable amount of weapons at their disposal.

Azerbaijani nationalists are also keeping a large amount of weapons and ammunition.

The prosecutors were instructed to stop resolutely any attempts to kindle inter-ethnic strife. It was demanded that they intensify control over the observance of laws dealing with the protection of social rights of citizens and ensure the return of flats, occupied without permission, to their rightful owners who had to leave them as a result of massive unrest provoked by nationalists.

The session outlined measures for the union of law-enforcement agencies to help similar republican institutions.